DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 049 729 JC 710 107

AUTHOR	Vaughan, George B.
TITLE	Some Philosophical and Practical Concepts for Broadening the Base of Higher Education in Virginia.
INSTITUTION	California Univ., Los Angeles. ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Coll. Information.
REPORT NO	Topical-Pap-19
PUB DATE	Mar 71
NOTE	107p.
AVAILABLE FROM	UCLA Students' Store - Mail Out, 308 Westwood Plaza, Los Angeles 90024 (Price available on request)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS	*College Planning, College Role, *Educational Development, *Educational Objectives, Educational Responsibility, *Junior Colleges, *Master Plans
IDENTIFIERS	*Virginia

ABSTRACT

This topical paper is a record of the events leading to the creation of a statewide system of publicly supported comprehensive community colleges for Virginia. Commission and legislative reports are reviewed, as are contributions made by influential state legislators, educational leaders, and outside consultants. The plan finally enacted provided for: (1) comprehensive institutions, and (2) a statewide master plan for the establishment of community colleges. This study is a historical record for Virginia, but it can also serve as a model for other states to document the development of their community college plans. (CA)

ED049729

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION
& WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

SOME PHILOSOPHICAL AND PRACTICAL CONCEPTS FOR BROADENING THE BASE OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN VIRGINIA

George B. Vaughan

JC 710 107

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges

Graduate School of Education and the University Library
University of California
Los Angeles 90024

Topical Paper No. 19
March 1971

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

MAY 20 1971

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

This Topical Paper was prepared pursuant to a contract with the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Points of view or opinions do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

TOPICAL PAPERS

1. A Developmental Research Plan for Junior College Remedial Education. July 1968. Out of print. ED 022 479.

2. A Developmental Research Plan for Junior College Remedial Education; Number 2: Attitude Assessment. November 1968. Out of print. ED 026 050.

3. Student Activism and the Junior College Administrator: Judicial Guidelines. December 1968.

4. Students as Teachers. January 1969.

5. Is Anyone Learning to Write? February 1969.

6. Is It Really a Better Technique? March 1969. Out of print. ED 030 410.

7. A Developmental Research Plan for Junior College Remedial Education; Number 3: Concept Formation. August 1969. Out of print. ED 032 072.

8. The Junior College in International Perspective. January 1970.

9. Identifying the Effective Instructor. January 1970.

10. Financing Higher Education: A Proposal. February 1970.

11. The Person: A Conceptual Synthesis. March 1970.

12. The Position Papers of Black Student Activists. September 1970.

13. Case Studies in Multi-Media Instruction. October 1970.

14. The Laws Relating to Higher Education in the Fifty States, January 1965-December 1967. October 1970.

15. Nationwide Pilot Study on Articulation. December 1970.

16. The President's Reaction to Black Student Activism. January 1971.

17. The Dynamic Interaction of Student and Teacher. February 1971.

18. Directions for Research and Innovation in Junior College Reading Programs. February 1971.

19. Some Philosophical and Practical Concepts for Broadening the Base of Higher Education in Virginia. March 1971.

Copies are available from UCLA Students' Store - Mail Out, 308 Westwood Plaza, Los Angeles 90024. Prices are available on request. The out-of-print issues are available (by ED number) from ERIC Document Reproduction Service, Leasco Information Products, Inc., 4827 Rugby Ave., Bethesda, Maryland 20014. Microfiche (MF) is $.65 per title, regardless of size; hard copy (HC) costs $3.29 per unit of 100 pages or less. Payment must accompany orders of $10.00 or less and should include sales tax where applicable. No handling charge is required.

CONTENTS

Introduction i

Part I Some philosophical and practical concepts for broadening the base of higher education in Virginia 1

Part II Establishing the need for more post-high school education in Virginia 13

Part III The development of a system of technical colleges 30

Part IV Laying the foundations for a statewide system of community colleges 46

Part V Action and reaction: The establishment of a community college system 65

Part VI A final word 88

Bibliography 93

INTRODUCTION

A risk engendered by any rapidly moving social development is that those most directly associated with it are so involved with the challenges and demands of the moment that inadequate attention is given to recording what is transpiring. As a result, future students of the development, and even interested contemporaries, are denied an accurate account of what occurred. This is a great danger in the junior college movement. Consequently, it is fortunate when a competent and well-qualified person records the events leading to the creation of a statewide system of publicly supported comprehensive community colleges. That is precisely what George Vaughan has done for Virginia in this report.

The Commonwealth of Virginia, a state generally viewed as steeped in the tradition of élitism in higher education, presents a particularly significant case study in the community college movement. Vaughan's research shows, however, that the philosophical base for the decision to initiate such a comprehensive post-high school system exists in the roots of Virginia's own history.

The plan finally enacted by Virginia contained two noteworthy and laudable features. It provided for comprehensive institutions and for a statewide master plan for the establishment of community colleges. This process, as Vaughan ably demonstrates, was evolutionary. Virginia, as other states have done, traveled the route of university two-year branch campuses and technical colleges. These developments were interspersed with numerous commission and legislative reports. Vaughan reviews these reports along with the contributions made by influential state legislators, educational leaders, and outside consultants. He effectively demonstrates that, as is so often the case, Virginia's present exemplary plan was made possible in no small measure by committed, forward-looking men who were up to the demands of the moment.

This record of Virginia, in addition to its historical significance, will, we hope, serve as both a model and an inspiration for educators in other states to document the development of their community college plans.

Raymond E. Schultz
Professor of Higher Education
Florida State University

SOME PHILOSOPHICAL AND PRACTICAL CONCEPTS FOR BROADENING THE BASE OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN VIRGINIA

George B. Vaughan

In 1966, the Virginia General Assembly passed legislation calling for the establishment of a statewide system of public community colleges. This movement toward the democratization of higher education was late in coming to a state that could point to the College of William and Mary as the second-oldest institution of higher education in America, and could claim Thomas Jefferson as its native son--one of the most important leaders in the fight for public education in America.

This broader base of higher education was especially slow in coming when one considers that in 1964 Virginia enrolled only 25.2 per cent of its entire college-age population (18-21) in higher education. For the same year, the percentages were 32.4 for the South and 43.7 for the nation as a whole (14:18).

In 1960, the median number of school years completed by Virginians twenty-five years old and older was 9.9; the national average was 10.6 years. The years of formal schooling completed ranged from a low of 6.5 in Buchanan County to a high of 12.8 in the city of Arlington. That age group in 86 of the 97 counties and 10 of the 32 independent cities did not reach the state median of 9.9 years (38:18). By 1963 Virginia was a debtor state in higher education; over 10,000 more students left it for their higher education than came to it (64:18).

The Higher Education Study Commission, authorized by the 1964 General Assembly and appointed by the Governor, stated in its 1965 report that "there can be no other conclusion but that Virginia is failing to provide higher education within its borders to the extent that would be justified by the relation of the State's population and economic resources to the national totals" (64:4). Even if the percentage of college-age youths did not increase in proportion to the total population, and if the percentage of them going on to college did not rise, Virginia was facing the 1960s with a program of higher education that would keep its population well below the national average in years of schooling completed. But the percentage of college-age youth was estimated to increase 75 per cent from 1960 to 1985 (65:ix), and the increase in the percentage going to college was projected as 4.2 per cent from 1964 to 1970 (14:18).

The legislators who met in 1966 had had an opportunity to read the findings of the 1965 Study Commission; therefore, they logically concluded that something must be done to improve the educational level of the state. Their proposed remedy was to establish a statewide system of comprehensive community colleges (32b:1136-1141).

In 1965, the comprehensive community college could be thought of as a democratic two-year college in that it offered equal access to higher education to most of its citizens. It was comprehensive in that it offered a variety of courses in addition to the university-parallel ones; it was community-oriented in that its programs were designed to serve its own area; and its philosophy encompassed the belief that, as education is a lifelong process, educational opportunities should be provided for both adults and youth (8:94-95).*

---

*While this book was written before 1965, it sums up the general concept of a comprehensive community college and thus serves as a point of departure for an examination of what the Virginia State Board saw as a comprehensive community college.

The Virginia State Board for Community Colleges* accepted the above broad concept of the comprehensive community college. In its policy manual--adopted September 28, 1966, only a few months after the General Assembly enacted the law creating the community colleges--the board defined a community college as

> . . . an institution of higher education offering programs of instruction generally extending not more than two years beyond the high school level, which shall include, but not be limited to, courses in occupational and technical fields, the liberal arts and sciences, general education, continuing adult education, pre-college and pre-technical preparatory programs, and specialized services to help meet the cultural and educational needs of the region (57:1).

Certainly many Virginians before 1966 realized that the state was not adequately preparing enough of its citizens for their roles in twentieth-century America. That they believed that the base should be broadened to include more students and more programs does not indicate that they wanted anything as comprehensive as the present-day community college system. It does mean, however, that certain key people--key in that they could make their views known--rejected the status quo and advocated change.

There were both practical and philosophical reasons for this broadened higher education in Virginia. All the views presented in the following pages, while not necessarily incorporated in the present-day community college philosophy, held to the belief that the opportunities for post-high school education offered the youth of Virginia were too limited.

As early as 1909, J. D. Eggleston, Jr., the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, stated that the "great work to be done in this State is not merely to

---

*This board was created by the Virginia General Assembly in 1966.

put children to school, but to put all the people to school--that is, to put all the people, young and old, to studying how to improve themselves and their occupations, and how to improve community conditions through proper cooperation" (72:1). In the same address, Eggleston suggested that "the school must reach out and strengthen the social and economic (in other words, the everyday) life of the community in which it is situated. To do its work properly, it must touch intelligently, sympathetically, constantly, and consciously every social and economic interest that concerns the community" (72:3).

In 1925, a paper by Robert B. Tunstall, "The Duty of the State to Higher Education," emphasized the service function of American higher education. The author stated that "the vastly increased complexities of modern life have immeasurably heightened the intellectual requirements of citizenship" (74:3). The desired traits of American citizenship could be produced only through higher education, which "is bounded only by the legitimate occupations and aspirations of man, and must keep pace with the progress of knowledge, whithersoever it may lead" (74:4).

Also in 1925, Edwin A. Alderman, then president of the University of Virginia, suggested that all levels of education complement each other and that "the distinction men draw between primary, secondary, and higher education is not an essential distinction, but one of convenience" (70:1).

In a 1939 study, the Superintendent of Public Instruction for Virginia, while concerned with offering a more diverse program in a "comprehensive high school," noted that an educational program offering such things as industrial education, homemaking, business education, health, recreation, art, and music (in addition to the usual program of academic studies) could contribute greatly to raising the cultural and living standards of a community (68:27-28). He suggested that each community

be surveyed to see "how the school can best serve the community" (68:44).

In 1950, Paul Farrier, the dean of admissions at Virginia Polytechnic Institute, presented a paper asking, "Can Top-Quartile Virginia High School Graduates Afford to Go to College?" His own answer was that many of them indeed could not afford the cost of a college education. He concluded that their failure to go to college was a great waste of human resources and that something must be done. He stated that "somewhere between thirty and forty-two per cent of our high school graduates in the upper fourth of their class would like to go to college but do not do so for lack of money" (40:6). Farrier suggested that more students attend college from urban centers than from rural areas because it is possible for urban students to attend college <u>while living at home</u> (40:3). Further, he concluded that "a two-year basic college course offered in practically all the colleges of the state in the realm of general education, and transferable to other colleges in the state at face value if completed successfully, would be a [illegible]g step toward serving the needs of our people in the field of higher education" (40:4). The need for more higher education could be met in part through junior colleges located in the areas that had no college within commuting distance (40:5).

Certainly a statewide system of publicly financed community colleges would open the door for a number of the top students who could not otherwise further their education. In fact, if tuition were kept low and the curriculum broad, at least two reasons for not going to college would be alleviated and Virginia could expect to see more of its top high school graduates continue their education.

The conclusion reached by all the above studies was, simply stated, that Virginia was not serving its youth as it could and should. The resultant loss was what occurs from the failure of a society to utilize

the talents of its youth. Virginia was depriving many of its youth of the opportunity for higher education and the actions of the state tended to support the conclusion that "throughout the education history of Virginia there has run the theory that higher education is not a necessity but a luxury, to be sustained, as we buy objects of art for our homes, from the casual surplus that may remain after making provisions for other things deemed essential" (74:7).

The Virginians referred to above were educators or laymen interested in education. They could support their suggestions through documentation--but they could not act to any great extent. For higher education to find the support it ultimately needed, action would have to come from the political segment of society, but were the political leaders in Virginia interested in it? Or were they willing to accept the status quo and the belief that education was a luxury and not a necessity? Evidence suggests that many political leaders were indeed interested in the status of education in Virginia throughout much of the twentieth century.

In 1928, the results of a study authorized by the General Assembly was published. The study, headed by M.V. O'Shea of the University of Wisconsin, concluded that the question on the cost of higher education was not whether the state could afford it, but, rather, whether state policy encouraged spending money on it (60:220). According to the report, some citizens believed that the state had no obligation to provide free education. Others felt that a youth "has a right to demand. . .an education which will enable him to develop his talents in the service of the State" (60:233).

The O'Shea commission recognized that some students needed something other than the traditional liberal arts--a curriculum that, in their case, would waste the taxpayers' money and the time of the institution and would damage, rather than help, those not prepared

for a liberal education. These students, the report suggested, should have vocational education (60:235). It further stated that those who were graduated from institutions of higher education were being drained from the state because they were being trained for "culture and professional occupations" and not for the jobs available (60:236).

The commission did not recommend a broadening of the base of higher education. (Vocational education, if developed as recommended, would not have been higher education (60:250)). The commission did touch on a philosophical concept that was to play a major role in the development of a statewide system of publicly supported community colleges. The study concluded that, although the information published in the report had been debated vigorously, there was "one thing (on which) all agree. The determination of what policy shall be pursued is a matter for the State to decide, and not for the educational institutions" (60:220). This decision made it possible to begin developing a statewide system of publicly supported community colleges.

In 1936, the results of a state-supported study headed by economist William H. Stauffer were published. The study concerned almost entirely the financing of higher education and how it could be made more efficient (52). Stauffer was still being heard as late as 1950, when an editorial in the Richmond Times-Dispatch by Virginius Dabney, one of Virginia's best-known editors, endorsed his views and called on the localities to do more in health, education, and welfare, and to ask the state for less financial aid (27a). Certainly this attitude did not encourage a broader base for higher education if it was to be paid for by the state. In fact, in 1966 many sections of the state were too poor to provide enough money to develop anything approaching a comprehensive community college in their own areas.

In 1944, the General Assembly adopted a resolution

"appointing a commission to make a thorough and complete study of the public school system of Virginia (66:3). After completing its study, the commission recommended that vocational education should be available to all who might benefit from it (66:109). It was to be, in part, post-high school in nature, but would not lead to a college degree. The system was to be statewide--a plan the commission believed most citizens of the state would support (66:24).

Thus, although the 1944 commission went on record as favoring broader post-high school education in Virginia, no enabling legislation was passed to make it possible.

The 1948 session of the General Assembly called for the Virginia Advisory Legislative Council to study higher education in the state and to make recommendations on its future. Echoing the findings of a 1947 study on state government, the Assembly wanted to determine the overlapping functions of institutions of higher education (63:1). The report of the Subcommittee on Higher Education of the Governor's Advisory Council on the Virginia Economy felt itself unable to make the study, but did submit guidelines for it. The subcommittee believed that among the most important items to be examined were the organization and control of higher education and the possibility of establishing a statewide system of community colleges. These colleges would provide educational opportunities close to home for more students (63:1-2). If established, they would serve students wanting technical and semi-professional training, those wanting post-high school occupational training, those wanting preparation for professional schools or the first two years of a liberal arts education, those wanting to get some general education before going to work, and adults wanting to continue their education while working full-time (63:4, 10-11).

The subcommittee's report (1950) called for a comprehensive system of post-high school education

(similar to the one that finally began in 1966 with the opening of the first community college in the statewide system). But the 1948 resolution and the subcommittee's 1950 report were calling only for a study and suggesting direction. The study was yet to be done.

The consultant chosen to conduct the study was Fred J. Kelly, Specialist in Higher Education, U.S. Office of Education (51:3). Among his findings was that the state needed "short techincal and semi-professional courses to prepare for the many types of callings which require post-high school training but do not require four-year curricula" (51:5). Kelly pointed out that

> For every engineer, industry needs several technicians. Doctors and dentists need laboratory technicians to help them. Practical nurses can do much to solve the nurse shortage. In almost every professional pursuit there is need for persons with less than full professional training (51:19).

He was not ready to offer a solution to the problems of providing more trained technical and semi-professional personnel, for he stated that "how Virginia is going to provide such short-course technical and semi-professional training is still largely an unsolved problem" (51:19). As a consultant, he obviously saw his role only as calling attention to the various problems of higher education in the state, and not as offering solutions to them.

Just as he did not call for community colleges, neither did Kelly recommend a statewide network of any type of two-year college. He believed, however, that the state could profit from a more extensive network of branch colleges such as the ones established by William and Mary (51:30).*

---

*William and Mary established a branch in Norfolk in 1930. This is now Old Dominion College, a separate state-supported institution. Richmond Professional Institute was established as another branch in 1925; today, it is part of Virginia Commonwealth University.

He felt that the service offered by the University of Virginia Extension Division played an important role in providing higher education for areas that would not otherwise have it. He also praised the University for being the only institution offering extension work, thus avoiding any overlap of functions (51:33).

Kelly's was the most extensive study on Virginia higher education up to that time (1951). That it failed to recommend a statewide network of two-year colleges did not necessarily mean a rejection of the idea that more people should receive education beyond high school. In fact, it clearly supported the idea, as shown by its emphasis on the need for vocational and technical education at the post-secondary level, but the General Assembly was not ready to implement any plan of coordination for higher education in the early 1950s. Instead, another study commission was to be established.

The 1954 session of the General Assembly adopted a joint resolution directing the Virginia Advisory Legislative Council to study and report on the extension services of the various institutions of the state (39:5). The urgency of the situation, as felt by the group conducting the study, is shown by its title: <u>The Crisis in Higher Education in Virginia and a Solution</u>. The "crisis" was the growing number of college-age students and the lack of facilities to meet their needs. The solution offered by the committee was the establishment of two-year branches of existing institutions (39:6-14). It specifically rejected the community college because, in part, the commission felt that "it has been extremely difficult to maintain uniform standards of quality for the instruction offered by such community colleges, and in some instances accreditation by the recognized accrediting associations has not been obtained" (39:11).

The commission recognized the worthwhile contributions of private junior colleges, but contended that they were able to contribute because they have "generally

been fully realistic as to their mission" (39:11). The community colleges, the commission maintained, would find it difficult to stick to their central purpose, and, in fact, might have to face pressures that would attempt to make them four-year institutions (39:11).*

This attitude to the comprehensive community college concept seemed more a dislike of the name "community college" than a rejection of its underlying philosophy. Some advantages of the branch college approach, as listed by the committee, would apply equally well to a comprehensive college. They were that branch colleges were less expensive to both the state and the student than the four-year institution; branches needed no dormitories; they could offer terminal courses to serve the many students who otherwise might not be able to gain admission to a four-year institution; they would screen out those who could not make it at a four-year college; and, finally, they could train skilled personnel for industry and allow students in such highly specialized programs as nursing to get their first year of training at the local branch (39:12). This study, then, although specifically rejecting the community college, actually advocated much that was later incorporated into the statewide system. One might even say that the committee rejected a name (community college), not a concept. Its strongest argument against the community college was the fear of its not being accredited. As will be shown later, this fear did not die easily.

In 1959, a legislative study further discouraged the democratization of post-high school education in Virginia. While not rejecting it outright, the study pointed out that the state's cost for educating the college student was increasing, while the cost to the student was decreasing. The commission stated: "This trend toward increasing the percentage of the State's share of the cost of

---

*It is interesting to note that Governor Mills Godwin, Jr., warned the people in a speech in Roanoke Oct. 23, 1969, against applying pressure on the community colleges to become four-year institutions (28m).

higher education should be halted and, if possible, reversed" (50:7). The study advocated branch colleges--not as a means of increasing the availability of higher education, but of reducing cost. Perhaps the key to the commission's philosophy lay in the following statement: Virginia has sought to afford public education to all children through high school. It has not adopted a policy of universal college education, nor in our judgment should it do so (50:9; italics added). The commission recommended that state-supported institutions increase tuition materially for all students, that the fees for out-of-state students be increased, and that television be used as a more economical approach to higher education (50:10-11).

Obviously this 1959 commission was in no mood to move toward the democratization of higher education in the state. In fact, its mood was belligerent toward making it more readily available at the taxpayer's expense. This attitude, if allowed to prevail, would surely have killed any movement toward a comprehensive system of higher education for all citizens. Yet, up to that point in history (with the possible exception of the "suggested guidelines" offered in 1950 by the Subcommittee on Higher Education), no one person or group had seriously proposed offering every youth in Virginia an opportunity to obtain inexpensive post-high school education.

As the 1960s approached, various economic, social, and political forces not only failed to advocate higher education for the masses, but actually worked against it. Ironically, though, it was the late 1950s that produced the first major study concerned with the desirability and feasibility of a network of two-year colleges in the state. In December 1959, a study authorized by the Virginia State Council of Higher Education and directed by S. V. Martorana was published. It was entitled Needs, Policies and Plans for 2-Year Colleges in Virginia. From this point on, the comprehensive community college was no stranger to any legislator or other citizen who wanted to take the time to read the 1959 Martorana study.

Part II

ESTABLISHING THE NEED FOR MORE POST-HIGH SCHOOL EDUCATION IN VIRGINIA

In 1956, the General Assembly created the State Council of Higher Education "to promote the development and operation of a sound, vigorous, progressive, and coordinated system of higher education in the State of Virginia." It was to be the agency for coordinating both the biennial budget requests and the off-campus extension and public service offerings of all state-controlled institutions of higher education. Especially important for the development of a statewide network of two-year colleges was that part of the law making the council responsible for reviewing the need for and location of new institutions of higher education: "No State institution of higher learning shall establish any additional branch or division or extension without first referring the matter to the Council for its information, consideration and recommendation and without specific approval by the General Assembly of the location and type of such branch or division . . . ." The intention of the law was that, from then on, the state-supported institutions of higher education in the state were to "constitute a coordinated system."

The General Assembly made it clear that the council was not to be a "super-board," for it stated that "in carrying out its duties the Council insofar as practicable shall preserve the individuality, traditions and sense of responsibility of the respective institutions." Further, its powers were to be limited to those outlined by the law creating it; the governing boards of the individual institutions were to continue to make policy and, in general, to operate as they had in the past.

Also important for the future development of a statewide system of community colleges was the clause stating that "in addition to the other powers and duties herein

imposed upon the Council, the Council shall undertake such studies in the field of higher education as the Governor and General Assembly, or either of them, may from time to time require of it" (36).*

The establishment of the State Council of Higher Education gave the state the coordinating body that had been the subject of so many speeches and studies in the past. Future studies could now devote their energies to some area other than coordination and would soon produce results.

In 1959, the council authorized a study to determine the need for comprehensive two-year colleges in Virginia. The council, after completing it, was to relay the results to the General Assembly, which, in turn, was to decide "whether the children now in elementary and secondary schools will have the opportunities for college education equal to those that the legislators, themselves, and other adult Virginians enjoyed" (56:ix). Chosen to head the study, as noted earlier, was S. V. Martorana, Chief, State and Regional Organization of the U. S. Office of Education. He was assisted by Ernest V. Hollis, Ken August Brunner, and D. Grant Morrison. Morrison, at the time of the study, was Specialist, Community and Junior Colleges, for the USOE. This study, by these four competent people, was the first to make a thorough examination of the need for a statewide system of comprehensive two-year colleges.

The study reached several conclusions of significance to anyone concerned with broadening the base of higher education in Virginia. It concluded that, in 1959, gaps existed in the state's educational opportunities. These gaps occurred primarily because only some areas of the state had access to institutions of

---

*In 1968, it was declared that no institution in the state should confer any college degree--academic, professional, or honorary--unless the council approved. This, of course, was not only an attempt to coordinate the granting of degrees, but also a weapon against "degree mills" that might hope to operate in the state.

higher education (56:2). Obviously, then, these gaps could be filled if every Virginian were within commuting distance of a college. The study group believed that a decentralized system of two-year colleges would be economical for both the state and the student. The student would save money by living at home and the state would save by not having to provide housing (56:3). The State Council of Higher Education should, the Martorana group insisted, recommend to the General Assembly that a number of two-year colleges be developed. "Unless the State Council takes action to launch and implement a sound policy and program of two-year college development, there is a danger that haphazard and wasteful local efforts will develop on a unilateral basis (56:4). Again, one sees the concern for coordination of higher education creeping into the discussion. (By this time, of course, the state council was active and already serving this coordinating function.)

The Martorana study recommended that the two-year college be comprehensive in nature and have "a definitive commitment" to serve its community. The offerings should include programs similar to those in the first two years of four-year institutions and in the more traditional junior colleges. In addition, they were to include occupational programs leading directly to employment after one or two years of preparation; they should also offer a wide variety of adult education and community-service programs. Great emphasis should be placed on guidance and counseling programs, which, along with a diversity of programs, would allow the students to develop their talents more fully (56:5-6). The programs advocated were similar to those recommended by the State Board for Community Colleges (as discussed in the first part of this paper). Martorana and his associates were aware that, if a student were to develop

his talents, he must have an opportunity to enter a curriculum that would use them. The major difference in curriculum development between the Martorana study and the guidelines of the State Board for Community Colleges was that the latter emphasized the need to give the students a chance to work in foundation (remedial or developmental) areas, while the Martorana study did not.

The 1959 study did not recommend an independent system of two-year colleges. Instead, it suggested that the existing system of higher education be used to establish and control the two-year colleges (56:5). "It is wiser to modify existing policy in the light of new developments than to completely depart from what has operated successfully in the past" (56:35). When asked why the study recommended that the two-year colleges remain under the control of the four-year institutions instead of going under a separate system, Martorana stated:

> We (the four consultants) did it because we wanted to set up in Virginia a transitional period--an interim plan. We knew that it was impossible, practically, to help Virginia leap into the future completely in one step. . . . We had to shake the technical colleges loose from the State Board of Vocational Education and so on. So this was a transitional arrangement (83).

Yet the consultants, while acknowledging that historical precedent must be considered, did not imply that former state policy must be rigidly adhered to, but only that the plan adopted should not "do violence to the precedents" observed over the years. In fact, no historical precedent existed for the use of local tax funds on a continuing basis to support higher education, but the Martorana study suggested that this be changed. It recommended that the local area bear the

total cost of the site and site development and that it be encouraged to help meet the initial cost of buildings and equipment (56:13,35-36,53-57). "In most of the areas visited, the opinion was expressed that public two-year colleges should be financed by tuition and state funds only. . ."(56:40). The study rejected, however, the idea that one-third of the cost of a student's education should be financed by tuition. No student should be "priced out of higher education" (56:41).

Martorana and his associates showed their awareness of historical precedent by rejecting the idea that each local college should have its own board of visitors and that there should be a state board for two-year colleges. The study "concluded that an evolutionary change in the existing structure to bring into it new two-year colleges would be more effective than a serious modification of the established state plan" (56:5).

The Martorana plan called for the State Council of Higher Education to serve as the overall coordinating agency for the new two-year colleges, but, as the new colleges developed, they were to be placed under the board of visitors of existing state institutions of higher education that offered general education. While rejecting an independent board of visitors for each two-year college, the study did recommend that a "citizens' local college committee of from 7 to 9 persons" be appointed by the board of visitors that governed the local college. This local board was to insure that the college served its own community. The local two-year college should have its own budget for development and operation and its chief administrator (to be chosen by local college committees, not by the parent institution) should have a direct line of communication with the top executive of the sponsoring institution

(56:6-7,53-57). (This would normally be the president of the four-year institution that sponsored the two-year colleges.)

The 1959 Martorana study emphasized that the new colleges, although under the "umbrella" of the established institutions, should primarily provide educational services in their own location, "thus broadening the base for higher education. Therefore, it is important that each two-year college have an orientation and dedication to a local service" (56:8; italics added).

The above was not an unqualified endorsement for local action. In fact (again returning to the control issue), the study pointed out that local effort might result in waste that could be prevented through careful overall planning (56:17-18,34). The plan called for local planning, but local planning subject to review by the State Council of Higher Education to prevent the overlap of programs within an area.

The study recommended that the programs offered by the vocational-technical schools in Danville, the Staunton-Waynesboro area, and Washington County be expanded to become community colleges (56:9).* Adhering to the comprehensive concept, the study pointed out the danger of failing to use the two-year colleges for technical and occupational courses as well as the more traditional offerings in liberal arts. The failure would be "both economically wasteful and educationally unsound "(56:10).

The Martorana group was aware that Virginia was changing from an agricultural to an industrial economy. In 1956, expenditures for new and expanded plants had

---

*The functions of these area vocational schools have been absorbed by the Community College System in a manner similar to that recommended.

increased almost 1,000 per cent over 1939 figures; construction contracts in 1957 were $400 million higher than in 1941; and retail sales in 1957 were nearly six times greater than in 1939 (56:17-18).* The demand for clerical workers increased 93 per cent, while for farm laborers and foremen, it declined 32 per cent. A study in the Tidewater area of the state showed a shortage of medical technicians (56:17-18). If the demands of an industrialized society were to be met, the state must acknowledge its transformation and begin to offer an appropriate educational program.

The Martorana study set forth many ideas later incorporated into the statewide system of community colleges that finally emerged in 1966. As has been pointed out, the 1959 consultants did not feel that the community colleges should come under a separate board, but the 1966 law that eventually created the community college system did establish a State Board for Community Colleges. This particular point in the Martorana study, while perhaps important in implementing any plan of two-year colleges, was not important enough in itself to cause this sound study to fail. Yet fail it did. It did not bring about any significant changes in higher education and it failed completely in its primary goal--to bring about a statewide system of publicly financed two-year comprehensive colleges. It failed to produce a bill in the next session of the General Assembly that would say: "the children now in elementary and secondary schools will have the opportunities for college education equal to those the legislators, themselves, and other adult Virginians enjoyed." One must ask, before proceeding further into events leading to a statewide system of community colleges, why the 1959 Martorana

---

*While these figures do not take into account the decreasing value of the dollar, they demonstrate the shift toward a non-agricultural economy.

study failed.

Its failure was not due to rejection by the State Council of Higher Education. (In fact, this body gave unqualified endorsement to the plan.) The council recommended that the community colleges be given top priority and that, out of a recommended budget of $45,413,897 for capital requests for 1960-62, $5,453,510 be spent on community colleges (33:4-5). The council grasped the significance of what the Martorana study said about the contribution that could be made to higher education by the comprehensive two-year college. "The desirability of community colleges results from economies to be achieved both for the State and the student, from their effectiveness in providing specialized training of local manpower, and from their positive impact upon the education level of Virginia's citizenry"(33:4). The council hit on a key issue--one to be developed more fully later in this study--when it pointed out that "existing community institutions--branch colleges--do not conform to the comprehensive type of institution envisioned in the Martorana study"(33:6). Martorana, in a recent interview, stated that the State Council of Higher Education gave strong support to the plan and that "they, the Council, supported it throughout and did their best to get it through" (83). Martorana did not feel that there was any failure on the part of the council to provide adequate leadership. The breakdown between recommendations and implementation did not, then, come in the area of coordination.

Martorana insists that the plan failed because of opposition from the established four-year institutions. He states that:

> . . . the organized higher education establishment--the University of Virginia, even though it was a branch system we had in mind, didn't like the idea; especially since we strengthened the two-year colleges' identity and

> indicated that in the long run even more identity would have to be given them. This was the opposition that ultimately caused the whole idea not to get very far (83).

In a later part of the interview, Martorana stated that "the major universities didn't want to run the risk of losing dollars that they thought they controlled."

He maintains that the race issue did not discourage the expansion of higher education as recommended by his study, and that, when the question concerning race was asked, "in our surveys and probing into that, we got no overt or open indication that this should be a factor that in any way would influence our recommendation." Further, "no significant people or group that we interviewed or dealt with suggested a separate and equal or separate segregated system of two-year colleges" (83).

While the race issue in the late 1950s in Virginia is too complicated to investigate here, it seems it would surely have entered into any plan that intended to truly democratize post-high school education. Why, one must ask, would a state that had just taken its stand for "massive resistance" be willing to put millions of dollars into the system recommended by Martorana, whose diversity of programs could not legally be limited to the white race? One should also note that, although Dabney S. Lancaster, Chairman of the State Council of Higher Education, believed in abiding by the law, including the 1954 Supreme Court decision on school desegregation, he was also a Southerner who believed "in a simple justice that meant, for him, doing absolutely everything for the Negro that you did for the white but keeping the races separate" (9:148-149).

The race issue would probably have entered the picture if the movement toward a comprehensive program of post-high school education had ever reached the point where legislators were faced with supporting it with tax dollars or rejecting it. However, since the Martorana plan was not voted on in the General Assembly, the question

is academic and needs no further investigation at this point.

Before doing the study for the council, the team under Martorana had conducted one on higher education in Tidewater, Virginia, initiated by the Norfolk Junior Chamber of Commerce. The Junior Chamber paid for the study, including the cost of publishing the entire report.* Among its conclusions was that a comprehensive two-year college should be established to offer general studies and occupational programs and to be responsive to the needs of business and industry in the area. (53:13).

The Tidewater study showed that the citizens of the area were intensely interested in more post-high school education in the area. Parents naturally wanted to see their children get an education and were aware that its availability was a key factor in bringing industry to the state. A letter from the Vice-President of General Dynamics Corporation verified the latter belief; in it he stated that proximity of institutions of higher education was important in deciding where to locate new plants. Other top executives in other industries took a similar stand (53:59-60).

Local interest in developing a sound comprehensive program of post-high school education was documented by the Education Committee of the Virginia State Chamber of Commerce. "Undoubtedly, the demand for community college graduates with technical training will increase drastically in the next few years as more and more scientific processes become commonplace in production and distribution and other phases of business" (48:24-25). The study also showed that many employers were beginning to appreciate the two-year graduate. One industrial leader acknowledged that he was as valuable in most jobs

---

*The State Council of Higher Education paid for publishing the condensed version of the study.

as the four- or five-year college graduate (48:25).

The Chamber of Commerce study team concluded that the Virginia business and professional leaders recognized the importance of adult education and that Virginians in general would take advantage of night and extension courses if they were available. To satisfy completely the needs of the adult population, higher education "must offer both specialized and non-specialized courses in their extension or evening divisions" (48:27,28). The Chamber found that workers with such training as drafting, tool making, electronics, accounting, secretarial work, and other areas requiring two years of college were in great demand. One respondent to a questionnaire sent out by the Chamber replied:

> . . . one of the greatest needs in post-high school vocational training is the development throughout the state of sophisticated vocational programs designed to provide industry with an adequate supply of highly skilled technicians. There is currently a shortage of workers in Virginia who are qualified to meet industry's needs in the important occupational categories between skilled laborer and graduate engineer. Remedying this situation through expanded and strengthened post-high school vocational training would help tremendously in Virginia's efforts to attract new industry (48:37-38).

The respondents believed overwhelmingly that having a college within commuting distance (thirty miles or less) would be a significant advantage to their business (48:39).

Included in the Chamber of Commerce's study was a survey of the presidents of the senior institutions of higher education. One president made some points that were later considered in the development of a statewide system of community colleges. He stated that:

> If technical courses are included in the curricula offered by community colleges, then technical

> institutes are not needed. The current expansion of the community college program in Florida and California should be studied carefully. Virginia could profit immensely from the experiences of these two states. The cost of higher education in Virginia prohibits many capable youngsters from pursuing post-high school work. Also, the limited availability of strategically located community colleges will increase the number of students enrolled in higher education (48:59).*

Included in the report of the Chamber of Commerce were the recommendations that two-year institutions, including technical institutes, be established wherever they were clearly needed and that the base of higher education be widened considerably in all areas--extension service and graduate work, as well as two-year curriculums (48:76-77).

The Council of Presidents of State-Aided Institutions of Higher Learning in Virginia also acknowledge the influence of higher education on economic development in Virginia. In a special report, the Council of Presidents stated that for the "proper economic development of the Commonwealth . . . the higher education programs of the Commonwealth must be expanded to reach, or at least approach, national averages concerning enrollments and levels of public support considered important by modern industry considering expansion or new location" (47:1). The council also pointed out that Virginia could afford to pay more of the cost of higher education than it was currently paying, for, since tuition charges in state-supported institutions of higher education in Virginia were already higher than the national average, this source of revenue could not be expected to provide operating funds for the future. The Council of Presidents, while noting that the

---

*The author of this statement was not identified except as a president of a four-year institution of higher education in the state.

need for technical training was being publicized in the state, neither recommended nor rejected this approach to post-high school education (47:2-3,7,13).

The economic value of higher education was further documented by Joseph G. Hamrick, then Executive Assistant to the Governor of Virginia and Director of Industrial Development and Planning for Virginia. In 1964, he stated that there were not enough vocational-technical schools in the state (44:5). He further concluded that "economic growth is no longer possible without educational growth which includes expansion of curriculums as well as expansion of educational facilities. We must provide the kind of education that permits our young people to participate in our growing economy to the extent of their abilities (44:8).

Edwin E. Holm, an economist for the Virginia Division of Industrial Development, writing in the Virginia Economic Review in 1963, stated that "the changing economy is having more impact on our educational needs than at any time in our history" (18:2). The economy was undergoing a decline in farming and an increase in manufacturing.

> These changes . . . have brought about a significant upgrading in occupations . . . . Male employment in manufacturing increased by 25 per cent for the decade, the number of technical and professional workers increased by an astounding 128 per cent, craftsmen by 42 per cent, semi-skilled workers (operatives and kindred) by 13 per cent, and laborers declined by 17 per cent. This occupational upgrading gives every indication that it is likely to continue (18:5).

Service industries increased 35 per cent in the 1950s, and medical- and health-related employment was up 72 per cent to more than 50,000 persons in 1963. While not recommending a particular program of development, Holm concluded that, unless the state developed a broad

program of post-high school education, "Virginia will lose an opportunity to be of great service to its people and the nation" (18:6,8).

The State Council of Higher Education's biennial report for 1958-60 acknowledged that Virginia's increasing population and its transition from an agricultural to an industrial economy were two factors putting pressure on higher education to provide more post-high school education (33:1). The council stated that:

> . . . the desirability of community colleges results from economies to be achieved for the State and the student, from their effectiveness in providing specialized training of local manpower, and from their positive impact upon the educational level of Virginia's citizenry (33:4).

The council, while advocating (in addition to the college-transfer curriculum) a comprehensive program including courses leading to employment upon graduation, failed to acknowledge that a community college might be needed in an area that already had a public four-year institution. The council recommended that community colleges be established only in areas beyond

> . . . reasonable commuting distance to an existing public institution of higher learning, and that said areas be required to meet such other objective criteria as are established to assure economical operation of these institutions (33:5).

This recommendation was made even though the council knew that only the Norfolk Divisions of William and Mary (Old Dominion College today) and Virginia State approached the comprehensive type of community college it recommended (33:6). While the council endorsed the concept of comprehensive community colleges in its 1960 publication, it did not at the time endorse a statewide system. It was by no means through with the

concept, however.

In its report for 1960-62, the Council of Higher Education stated that "the growth of college enrollments and the increased interest in local communities for establishing post-high school educational programs has led the Council to formulate a more comprehensive policy for the development of community two-year colleges" (34:1). The council in reality rejected the concept of democratizing higher education for all Virginia youth, for it suggested that new two-year institutions be developed in locations where they would meet the greatest need (34:4). However, while not suggesting a statewide system, the council fully appreciated that a truly comprehensive college should offer transfer programs, terminal programs in a number of occupational fields, and a program of general adult education. At this time, the council was ready to recommend that the two-year community colleges be developed in two stages. First the community college was to be designated an "off-campus branch" of a four-year institution; second, when the off-campus branch grew in enrollment and programs to where "it is deemed advisable to provide a more extensive financial investment by the State," the two-year branch was to become a two-year college unit under the governing board of the parent institution (34:5).

Again, however, the council failed to acknowledge that students' talents and ambitions vary and that, if these capabilities were to reach fruition, a comprehensive program of post-high school education would have to be developed. The council's hesitation on this point is shown again (as in the 1958-60 report) by its insistance that a community college be at least thirty miles from existing public colleges accepting day students and that, to qualify for a site, the area must "provide evidence that the proposed program will not materially affect such private colleges as may be situated in the

area (34:7). One hardly needs to point out again that the four-year colleges in Virginia were neither comprehensive nor able to develop the talents of students wanting terminal programs to prepare them for employment.

For the purpose of this study, however, it is significant that the council recognized the merits of two-year community colleges and that it was ready with a plan for developing more of them. Philosophically, the council appeared to accept that broadening the base of higher education was not only desirable, but also possible. That it was not ready to go on record as recommending a statewide network of comprehensive community colleges appears to be more a matter of the council's concern with offering some type of education to the youth of the state than with offering comprehensive education to most of the youth. Its stand was on broadening the base through easier access to an institution of higher education and not necessarily on broadening the curriculum offerings at all colleges within commuting distance of Virginia's youth.

One can thus see that Virginians were relating education to economics and that the State Council of Higher Education was ready to offer a plan whereby more Virginians might receive higher education. In addition, Virginia was feeling the pressure of an increasing number of college-age youth. It was estimated that the college-age (18-21) population would increase from 216,880 in 1960 to 380,000 in 1985--an increase of 75 per cent in the twenty-five year period (65:ix). Virginia's total population in 1964 was 4,378,000, an increase of almost 32 per cent over the 1950 population. During the same years, the total population of the United States increased by 27 per cent, but in the South, by less than 25 per cent.

Also in 1964, over half the state's population was concentrated in six metropolitan areas. Finally, it was estimated that Virginia's college enrollment would increase from 78,000 in 1964 to 120,000 in 1970. As A. J. Brumbaugh declared, "This means that during a six-year period public higher education in Virginia will have to expand to accommodate more students than the total increase in the numbers enrolled in these institutions during the preceding 14 years--1950-1964" (35:10-11). As pointed out in the first part of this study, Virginia was enrolling only 25.2 per cent of its high school graduates in college in 1964.

When one considers that industrial leaders, educational consultants, economists, the State Council of Higher Education, Chambers of Commerce, and various other groups were aware of the need for a broader base for higher education and that the number of college-age students was increasing rapidly, one might safely conclude that higher education in Virginia was due for a change. Could the state provide the technical education called for by industry? Could it offer educational opportunities to most of its youth as recommended by the council? Was Virginia really ready to meet what might rightly be called the "impending crisis" in higher education? It would appear that, if the state intended to meet the crisis, it must try to meet the needs of both its economy and its citizens. Thus the legislators were soon to decide that the answer lay in the development of a system of technical colleges.

Part III

THE DEVELOPMENT OF A SYSTEM OF TECHNICAL COLLEGES

Virginia had put forth some effort toward meeting the crisis in higher education. The State Council of Higher Education pointed out that in 1960 the state had eight institutions classified as "community colleges." It defined "the essential characteristic of a community college (as not being) the level of its programs, but the fact that it is a non-residential institution, responsive to the needs of its local community" (34:14). Three of the eight were four-year institutions; the remaining five were two-year colleges under the control of the University of Virginia, Virginia Polytechnic Institute, or The College of William and Mary. Only two of them, however, approached any degree of comprehensiveness in their course offerings.

By 1964, there were eleven two-year colleges. Of these, five were under the control of the University of Virginia, four under Virginia Polytechnic Institute, and two under The College of William and Mary (35:47-48). One should not be deceived, however, into thinking that the two-year college of 1964 was the same as the comprehensive community college later advocated by the General Assembly and State Board for Community Colleges in 1966. First, the enrollment in the eleven publicly financed two-year colleges amounted to only 3,314 students--out of a total of 78,041 students enrolled in all institutions of higher education in the state. Of the students in the state-controlled two-year colleges in 1964, 79 per cent were in transfer programs. Only one of the two-year colleges (Roanoke Technical Institute) enrolled any appreciable number in terminal programs (101 students out of a total

of 109). Four of the two-year branches offered no terminal-occupational programs, but even more telling was that nine of them offered no adult education; the other two taught a total of only 77 adults (35: 49-57). In 1964, the two-year colleges were comprehensive in no major way. They developed neither as Martorana recommended nor as the State Council of Higher Education visualized them.

Not only did the two-year branches lack terminal programs and adult education, but they also had highly selective admission requirements (73:1). One study showed that the students in the state-controlled two-year colleges in Virginia were academically superior to those in the private two-year colleges (73:118). The branches not only did little to democratize higher education in the state, they even appeared to cater to the "cult of the bachelor's degree," as A. J. Brumbaugh put it. "Social pressures in the past have been toward higher education for recognized degrees. This seems to be especially true for Virginia" (35:62).

One should note that the branch college was the first major attempt by Virginia to offer community-based higher education (as discussed earlier, one legislative commission saw the branch-college approach as the solution to Virginia's educational crisis), but one should also note that this approach had certain shortcomings.

Donald E. Puyear, the Director of one of Virginia Polytechnic Institute's branch colleges and later president of a college in the community college system, made perceptive remarks about the branch colleges. In an interview, he stated that Virginia Polytechnic Institute exercised too much control over the branch.

This was true particularly in the academic area.

> It was a most strangulating situation. We were too offer only courses that were offered at V.P.I. We used the same outline and the same textbooks. There was nothing left to the discretion of the faculty at the branch. Our faculty then became the second rate faculty as far as the faculty members on the main campus were concerned. In many cases our people were as qualified or even more qualified than those on the parent campus (85).

In the same interview, although Puyear expressed fear that a statewide system of community colleges, with control in Richmond, might result in too much control over the individual colleges, he maintained a wait-and-see attitude.

Perhaps the greatest shortcoming of the branches was their lack of comprehensiveness. Puyear, speaking on that issue, suggested that anything other than the university-parallel program at the branch he headed "would be somewhat of an embarrassment to the parent institution." While attempting to do some work in foundation courses and the occupational programs, Puyear admits that "we had to do a whole lot of what we were trying to do as a community college under the table. This was embarrassing to the administration on the home campus" (85).

A chairman of the local advisory board of a branch college (later the board chairman of the community college in his area), while praising the cooperation the college in his area had received from the parent institution, expressed some frustration with the programs at the branch colleges. He stated that, when he and other local citizens sought a college for their area, they had in mind "a college that would have a two-year collegiate program with a buildup of some of the terminal programs that would eventually serve a number of the students who were not equipped to enter college or to transfer to other schools." The chairman concluded that:

> . . . after several years of operation of the other branch colleges, V.P.I. was really interested only in the branch as a commuter school for the main campus at Blacksburg. We began to feel, and particularly in that respect, that we had been somewhat stifled by the attempts to set up a very high quality of education and the requirements were too high for most students of this area to get into (92).*

T. Marshall Hahn, President of Virginia Polytechnic Institute (and therefore president of the four V.P.I. branches), feels that the branches were making a contribution to higher education in the state, even though Virginia was lagging behind in the percentage of youth going on to higher education. Hahn believes that "one of the big deficiencies in our Virginia higher educational system was the absence of a system of community colleges." He points out that the selective admission policies of the branches excluded many students, a difficulty that would not likely exist in the case of community colleges (79).

State Senator William Stone, who fought long and hard to keep the two-year institution in his district a branch of the University of Virginia, feels that the branch colleges could not and should not offer a comprehensive program of occupational-technical programs. Stone contends that branches should be concerned only with university-parallel programs (90).

Prince B. Woodard, who became Director of the State Council of Education in September 1964, viewed the branch-college concept as limited. He felt it was not productive enough and did not serve the diverse needs of the state. He did not favor the

---

*Warren was chairman of the local board of the Clifton Forge-Covington Branch of Virginia Polytechnic Institute and later board chairman of the community college formed from the branch institution.

continuation of any of the two-year branches, although he realized that those that were ultimately to become four-year institutions should remain branches until the transition took place (93).

One can thus see that the branch colleges had certain shortcomings as far as truly increasing the availability of higher education in the state. The main failings were that the branches were too selective in their admission requirements and were not comprehensive enough to meet the needs of their area. They were neither meeting the needs of industry nor the needs of the students who did not want a university-parallel program. Either the branches had to broaden their offerings or the state must take other measures to insure that the talents of students who wanted occupational and semi-professional programs found an outlet.

The state had made some effort to meet the vocational needs of the students and industry. In 1964, there were nine area vocational-technical schools. Two of these had been in existence since 1944; no new ones had been established since 1959. Some of the programs were at the high school level; others catered mostly to high school graduates (35:80-82). None of them offered the two-year degree. In fact, they were not adequate in number, in level of offerings, or in the number of graduates they turned out. If, as predicted, from 1960 to 1970 a total of 65,000 technical workers would be required, it would mean training approximately 6,500 a year. In 1962, the area vocational and technical schools were educating only 600 students a year; high schools throughout the state were preparing 1,850 annually and some 2,000 were in training in industry. This meant that the additional number needed--who would have to be educated by the schools--would be 2,050 each year (69:6). Even with expansion, the area vocational-

technical schools would have a difficult time meeting the need for all these skilled workers. As the situation existed in the early 1960s, the area vocational schools were meeting the needs neither of industry nor of those students who did not want four years of college.

Governor Albertis S. Harrison, Jr., Governor of Virginia from 1962 to 1966, had made industrial growth a key issue in his campaign. In his first major address to the General Assembly, Harrison stated that, in all sections of the state, the primary concern of the people was industrial development. He pledged his administration to this industrial development.

> . . . Virginians are today demanding that the economy of their State be strengthened, and that they have an opportunity to earn incomes comparable to the best in any state in the Union. To a real extent, we have been successful in attracting new industry to Virginia and in encouraging expansion of existing plants. At the same time, there is a general feeling, right or wrong, that other states have been more aggressive and have been more successful. The competition for new industry among states is fierce. . . . There is a demand that Virginia have an active and vigorous industrial development program, and that the Governor of the State personally assume a more active role in this program (46a:5).

Governor Harrison was well aware of the role education must play in this development. Speaking of Virginia, he stated that "industries were interested in coming here, but only if they had a trained, skilled labor force waiting for them" (81). He believed that those workers must be trained in a fashion that would allow them to move quickly into middle-management positions--superintendents, foremen, and others capable of helping to run industry, and not simply of running the machines. The governor was convinced of the great need for this type of worker (81).

Speaking of the role of higher education in the total economic picture of Virginia, Harrison saw the community colleges as holding great promise for meeting the educational needs of the state and at the same time for allowing the state to avoid the giant universities found in some states.

> Technical institutes, operated as part of these community colleges, can also help provide the trained labor supply for industry throughout the State. Such development, however, must follow a systematic and orderly plan, or else we will suffer the chaos that must result from establishing institutions willy-nilly across the State (46a:5).

Harrison was philosophically as well as practically oriented to the need for more education. In his inaugural address, he stated his belief that the citizens of the state could expect their government to provide them with adequate education. He expected "to see a renaissance of education in Virginia, creating an atmosphere in which the minds of our people may grow in vision as the opportunities for the use of the mind can grow in scope" (45:5). He saw education and industrial development as a partnership--more education meant more industry and more industry meant that more and better educated workers were required (81).

Governor Harrison had been Attorney General during the previous administration. In that position, he had taken a middle-of-the-road stance during the period of massive racial resistance and had alienated only the most extreme segregationists. Most of the wounds of the period were healed during his subsequent administration (15:238-240). Obviously he realized that his key project--industrial development--could not be realized without racial tranquility. He stated

that:

> . . . my failure to mention the racial issue (in his first major address to the General Assembly) which has consumed so much of our time in years past is a deliberate omission. The progress that is so necessary to Virginia, and the programs that I ask you to consider, are designed for the welfare and happiness of all Virginians, irrespective of their race, color or creed (46a:34).

It was also obvious that the Harrison program of industrial development could not be achieved with the limited technical offerings of the branch colleges and the few graduates of the area vocational-technical schools. In fact, the need for more technical education brought a major breakthrough in extending post-high school education in the state.

This breakthrough came in part because, as his administration developed, Harrison "began to talk less of Virginia's glorious past and more of its present needs" (15:243). Included in the present needs was "an immediate re-evaluation of vocational and technical education in Virginia." This re-evaluation was necessary because of the "rapid growth of technological knowledge and the increasing urbanization of our population" (69:1).

In the 1960s Virginia was changing from a rural to an urban state. By 1965, over 53 per cent of the state's total population was contained in a relatively few urban centers (15:244). The members of the General Assembly were aware of the changing face of Virginia and of the new demands of an industrialized society. The 1962 General Assembly created a Commission on Vocational and Technical Education headed by Delegate D. French Slaughter, which was to make a study and recommend a course of action for improving

vocational and technical education in public post-high school institutions. The commission reported that:

> The nature of jobs now available in Virginia business and industry demands a higher level of skills from more people than is now afforded by the available vocational and technical training. In addition, if Virginia is to continue to attract new industry, the need for workers with new and advanced skills becomes even greater (69:1).

Further, the Virginia legislators and professional staff who made up the Slaughter Commission were aware that technical education was philosophically in tune with the times. Changing conditions "were creating greater respect for the status and dignity of vocationally trained workers. There is a growing awareness that the new jobs created by technological development can lead to rewarding lifetime careers" (69:1).

To be successful, technical education at the post-high school level obviously must undergo constant revision. The curriculum must be designed to meet the opportunities for employment in the institution's own community. The commission, acknowledging these facts, saw the greatest need for the expansion of technical education at the post-high school level. To administer it, the commission recommended that a State Board of Technical Education be created with the necessary staff to run the area vocational and technical schools (69: 13-16).

The Slaughter Commission recommended the expansion of the six existing vocational schools and the creation of five new ones. It suggested that the existing schools become a part of the proposed system, but maintained that the local areas should make this decision. The branch colleges were also to be used to produce

more technical graduates (69:6,15).

Governor Harrison gave his endorsement to the recommendations of the Slaughter Commission on Vocational and Technical Education. He stated: "I attest the accuracy of the commission's evaluation of the importance of vocational and technical education in Virginia. This matter is just as urgent, and its need just as impelling, as the commission portrays it to be." Further, the governor placed the "full support of his administration behind those who would porvide increased vocational and technical education in this State" He urged the General Assembly to implement a plan of technical education based on the recommendations of the commission (46b:19).

The General Assembly reacted favorably to Harrison's recommendation. In March 1964, it passed an act creating the State Board of Technical Education as well as the Department of Technical Education, which was to have a director appointed by the Governor, subject to confirmation by the General Assembly. The 1964 legislators felt that the "impending crisis" in Virginia's plan of post-high school education had reached such a state that "an emergency exists and this act is in force from its passage" (32a:672-75).

The State Department of Technical Education officially began operation on September 1, 1964. Dana B. Hamel, former Director of Roanoke Technical Institute, was chosen as its first director. Of twelve regions in the state that applied for a technical college, three were chosen: one in northern Virginia, one in Chesterfield, and the other in the Harrisonburg-Staunton-Waynesboro region.

But what was the system of technical schools to entail? Perhaps the best picture can be obtained from A Guide for the Establishment of Technical Colleges in Virginia. This document, published in February

1965 by the Department of Technical Education, gives a brief history of the development of the technical colleges, explains the underlying philosophical concepts of them, and serves as a guide for those regions wishing to apply for such a college.

The Guide defines a technical college as "a non-resident, multi-purpose, and area-centered institution that offers to high school graduates, and others who are not high school graduates but are older than the normal high school age, opportunities (for obtaining an education)." Curriculums for preparing technicians in engineering, medical, health, agriculture, business, service, and other fields were to be included. The technical college was also to offer classes for employed adults as well as trade courses for craftsmen. In addition, "where college transfer credit courses, either public or private, are not available, such courses may be offered subject to the approval of the State Council of Higher Education"(43:3-4).

The approach to the technical colleges was similar to that used in many comprehensive community colleges. Although the Guide always used the phrase "may include" in reference to college-parallel work, it makes the point that, although college-parallel and technical courses are discussed separately in the Guide, "there will be no rigid separation within the institution" (43:5). The Guide also contains provisions for foundation work and for awarding the Associate of Applied Science Degree (43:6). A. J. Brumbaugh, in commenting on the Guide, states that "in fact, the programs presented in the Guide are so broad in nature that a technical college patterned along the lines suggested would meet most of the criteria for a community junior college" (35:87).

The technical colleges in the Virginia system were designed to keep student costs low. Out of an estimated

operating cost of $800 per student per school year, the student was to pay $135, the state $585, and the locality $80. (The locality's expenditure of one-tenth of the operation costs was greater under the system of technical colleges than under the present system of comprehensive community colleges.)

The State Board of Technical Education was designed to exercise a great deal of central control--to determine student costs, to review applications from the political subdivisions requesting a technical college, and to appoint the chief administrative officer of the college (43:7-16).*

The technical college received immediate attention from areas across the state. Governor Harrison called it a "child of our times" and declared that it was a "college of necessity" rather than a place to escape from the world. He stated that "our new respect for the technician is a reflection of his growing importance . . . . This college is a part of this same reflection" (31b). One editor described the creation of the Department of Technical Education as a noteworthy accomplishment of Harrison's administration, going hand-in-hand with his other major accomplishment--bringing industry to the state (27e).**

One official termed the announcement of a technical college to be located in his area the "economic salvation" of the area, for he and other officials hoped that its establishment would bring industry to their region (25a).

---

*This reference contains a complete discussion on costs, control, and criteria for establishing a technical college.

**More than $900 million in new manufacturing plant investment was added during Harrison's four years; over 500 new manufacturing plants were added and 325 more expanded.

It was observed that the populous Northern Virginia area needed a technical college. The region had substantial industry and expected much more; the population density demanded that more college-level institutions be located there; and, according to one editor, the area must fight to get a technical college (24).

One writer, in commenting on the technical college, stated that the desirability of this "third level of education" was hardly debatable. He also believed that the technical college was not only a means of meeting the needs of the economy, but also an important factor in meeting human needs in today's society(28). Another writer in the same city called the move to establish a network of technical colleges "a bold, imaginative move which deserves to succeed (29a).

Five counties in industry-poor Southside Virginia viewed the technical colleges as a hope for future industrial development.

> When these schools are opened community leaders are hoping for a major increase in industrial interest for their rural areas. The supply of workers for industrial plants is available in these areas, but they are untrained in certain specialized areas. With these technical colleges located in areas where the worker lives, industrial prospects will locate where they can get workers trained for their individual types of needs (27d).

These favorable comments give some indication of how important the development of technical colleges was considered by various areas of the state. Yet, as with most moves that touch on the economic, social, and political lives of the citizens of a state, it was not without its critics.

The question of locating a technical school on the campus of an existing branch college became a political issue in the Hopewell-Petersburg area. Some groups

felt that Richard Bland College (a division of William and Mary) in Petersburg should have the technical college for the area, but the vice-mayor of Hopewell, after returning from a tour of technical schools in South Carolina, concluded that under no circumstances should a technical school be located at a liberal arts college. He contended that Petersburg was trying to "snatch the school" from his area (21).

David Y. Paschall, President of The College of William and Mary and former head of the State Department of Education, feared that over-emphasis on technical education might turn the students into "mechanical robots." He believed that local colleges should be expanded, but that they should maintain an emphasis on liberal arts (31a).

The Republican Party state chairman claimed that the proposed establishment of three technical colleges was "little more than window-dressing for the gubernatorial ambitions of Lt. Governor Mills Godwin." Delegate Willis M. Anderson, a Democrat from Roancke, claimed that the Republican charges were the result of "ignorance and malice." Anderson, one of the sponsors of the 1964 act establishing the State Department of Technical Education, stated that the purposes of the technical colleges were in no way political, but were designed to provide technical education for the youth of the state (29b). While the issue became political in a sense, it did not create widespread dissent in political circles. In fact, only one member of the House of Delegates and two members of the Senate voted against the law creating the Department of Technical Education (54a:206;55:517).*

---

*The two senators who voted against the bill were asked why they voted as they did. They did not reply to the inquiry.

Perhaps the most critical statement was made by a county supervisor from Augusta. He claimed that the move to establish state-operated technical colleges was the "biggest step our state has taken toward socialism." He felt that there was no need for the state to furnish an inexpensive education for its youth. He stated that "I am convinced that any boy or girl that (sic) has finished high school has enough grants available so they can go to college without the state paying for it" (28a). Most officials of Augusta County were apprehensive of the system of technical colleges, for they feared that it would destroy their area vocational school (28a).

In 1966, as Governor Harrison prepared to turn the state government over to his successor, Mills E. Godwin, Jr., he could indeed look back to his inaugural address and feel that he had witnessed something of a "renaissance in education" in the state. Harrison saw his administration as one of transition from a rural to an urban state. He had called for, and for the most part achieved, racial calm. He saw the real solution to racial problems as more and better educational opportunities and more and better jobs for all Virginians (27e). In his last address to the General Assembly, Harrison referred to the "totally new program of technical education" inaugurated under his administration. He also took pride in the fact that five branch colleges had been opened during his four years as governor. He pointed out that one technical college had been opened (Northern Virginia Technical College in September of 1965) and that funds for two more had been appropriated. In this last address, he recommended that money be appropriated for six more technical colleges in the next biennium (66c:4).

It appeared that Virginia, during the Harrison

administration, had finally settled on the direction for an expanded program of post-high school education. It seemed it was to include either branches or "community colleges" under the control of established institutions of higher education in the state and also a system of technical colleges under the control of the State Department of Technical Education.*

This, however, was not to be the case. The "renaissance" witnessed by Harrison was soon to receive new impetus--and this impetus was to lead to the development of a statewide network of public comprehensive community colleges.

---

*This approach, used then and now in South Carolina, had influenced the thinking of various Virginians during these years.

Part IV

LAYING THE FOUNDATIONS FOR A STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES

The 1963 Slaughter Commission, which recommended the establishment of a network of technical colleges, had also made another recommendation--one that indicated that the issue of post-high school education was far from settled in the commission's mind. It suggested that:

> In the long run, the State should consider meeting all of these post-high school educational needs through a system of comprehensive community colleges under the proposed State Board of Technical Education, perhaps with a more appropriate title. Consequently, the Commission recommends that the parent institutions (Virginia Polytechnic Institute, University of Virginia, and The College of William and Mary), the Council of Higher Education and the State Board of Technical Education make a joint study of the feasibility of such a system, with particular emphasis upon such problems as accreditation, transfer of credits and financial savings (69:15-16).

Similarly, the 1964 session of the General Assembly (that called for the establishment of a network of technical colleges) also made provision for the appointment of the Virginia Higher Education Study Commission. This commission, which made its report to the General Assembly in 1965, concluded that "the most urgent need in Virginia's program of higher education is the development of a system of comprehensive community colleges. The highest priority should be given to this development" (64:18).

The section on the two-year college of the Higher Education Study Commission was headed by a staff supplied by the Southern Regional Education Board. The major consultant and author of the two-year college report was A. J. Brumbaugh. Among his recommendations was that

"steps be taken as soon as feasible to transfer the two-year branches of the State's higher institutions, the post-high school area-vocational school programs, and the two-year technical colleges to the Community College and Technical Education Board" (35:10-11). The Community College and Technical Education Board was to replace the State Board of Technical Education established in 1964 for the technical colleges and was also to be the governing board for a statewide system of community colleges.

In 1966, the recommendations of the Slaughter Commission (1963) and the Higher Education Study Commission (1964) reached fruition with the passage of legislation calling for the establishment of a statewide system of publicly supported community colleges. The question that immediately arises is why the state decided to take a new direction in its movement to broaden its post-high school educational program.

It has already been suggested that the branch college was not comprehensive enough to meet the state's technical training needs; the technical college, by definition, was not comprehensive unless it added university-parallel programs similar to those at the branches. Was the establishment of a statewide system of Community Colleges revolutionary, or was it simply another step in the evolutionary process?--a process that saw

> . . . each one of (Virginia's) more vocal citizens . . . telling us essentially the same things. He is saying that regardless of where he comes from or where he works, regardless of his religious or political convictions, the color of his skin, or the size of his bank account, he wants equal opportunity, in every respect, for himself and for his children (26g).*

---

*From an address delivered by Governor Mills E. Godwin, Jr., to the state convention of the AFL-CIO.

The 1966 General Assembly, by passing legislation that would create a statewide system of comprehensive community colleges, took its biggest step in the democratization of post-high school education in Virginia. Virginians would be able to develop their talents, no matter where they lived. By calling for comprehensive colleges, the legislators acknowledged that, if their needs were to be met, the citizens must have a choice of what they studied in college.

The legislators meeting in 1966 did not have to look far into the past to discover that the comprehensive community college was not a revolution, but another step in the evolutionary process of utilizing the talents of more and more citizens. In fact, the link with the past was provided by the Slaughter Commission's 1963 report, which had thrust the state a step forward by emphasizing technical education.

The Slaughter Commission, by acknowledging that its recommendation on technical colleges was not the best answer to Virginia's educational needs, not only left the door open for future study, but also provided a point of departure (the comprehensive community college concept). Furthermore, the Slaughter report kept the development of a satisfactory college system in the political arena--the commission was politically appointed and headed by a politician--and therefore made it quite natural for the 1964 General Assembly to recommend another commission to undertake a "comprehensive study and review of higher education." Had the Slaughter Commission considered the two-year college issue closed, it is possible that the General Assembly would have gone along with its recommendation and excluded the two-year college from any subsequent study of higher education.

The Slaughter Commission also deserves credit for planting the idea of comprehensive community colleges

in the minds of key educators in the state. Delegate W. Roy Smith, the original chairman of the Commission on Vocational Education (the Slaughter Commission), states that its members asked the presidents of The College of William and Mary, the University of Virginia, and Virginia Polytechnic Institute how they felt about the possibility of allowing their branches to join a comprehensive system of community colleges (88). While the presidents were obviously not yet ready to sever their ties with the branches, the conversations with the members of the commission surely planted the ideas that would later allow this severance to be partly accomplished. As will be shown, the president of one of the above institutions went on record as favoring a statewide system of public community colleges. Other voices were also raised in favor of moving beyond the technical and branch-college concepts.

One editor viewed the technical colleges as part of the program for meeting the "educational explosion" that had hit the state. He realized that the two-year branches were a help in meeting the educational needs, but he also visualized the merger of the technical schools and the branches into a single system of two-year colleges (27c).

One city official stated that the "chief reason for supporting a state plan for the creation of a two-year technical college in the area . . . is that it could become the nucleus for a community college offering liberal arts as well as science courses." The official went on to say that he hoped the college in his area would ultimately become accredited and offer the youngsters an opportunity for an associate degree at minimum cost (23b).

One editor, in his review of the Harrison administration, suggested that the development of the technical colleges "paved the way for the sensational prospect that a comprehensive system of two-year community colleges, combining technical and liberal arts courses, will be established in the near future." He believed that, when

this was achieved, Virginia could look forward to improving its record of sending young people to college (27f).

Another writer saw the increase of post-high school education as "Virginia's Great Opportunity." He expressed the hope that the technical colleges would develop into "comprehensive community colleges." He wanted to see a number of two-year colleges throughout the state that would give the citizens a "well-rounded offering of courses, comprehending both the liberal arts and the humanities as well as scientific and technical disciplines" (27b).

Quite early, Senator Lloyd C. Bird went on record as favoring a tax-supported system of community colleges. He acknowledged that the public was demanding more education for more young people. Bird felt that Virginia had made only a start with its proposed system of technical colleges (28b).*

These observations demonstrate that the public was aware of education as an issue. They also demonstrate dissatisfaction with the existing approaches to meeting the post-high school needs of the citizens. There were other voices and other reasons for wanting to go down the comprehensive community college road instead of down several in attempting to meet these needs.

House Delegate W. Roy Smith, a member of the House since 1952, has served on several important committees on education and first headed the 1963 Slaughter Commission. He stated that he would not have been willing to go along with the branch and technical college approach--"It has been my own personal feeling from the outset that the two general types of education (should) be in one system." He saw the movement away from two distinct systems as an economical one, and felt that more students would take vocational and technical subjects if they

---

*Bird made these remarks prior to the publication of the report of the commission, of which he was chairman.

could do so in a comprehensive college (88).

Governor Harrison was aware that not everything was being done that should be to meet the state's higher educational needs. By endorsing the Virginia Higher Education Study Commission (Bird Commission), which did its work during his administration, Governor Harrison showed that he was most willing to take a further look at what was happening. Commenting on the need for further study, he stated:

> It became perfectly obvious that we did not have the information and background necessary to do the job that had to be done. Of course, once we started the program with the community colleges (branch colleges) and the technical and vocational schools, it caught fire all over the state. There was potential for all, and every community saw what it would mean to the young men and women who wanted to go on and secure a higher education. We had to have a comprehensive study to point the direction we were going . . . (81).

Others were also concerned with the direction Virginia was taking. State Senator Lloyd C. Bird was concerned when he saw the state's post-high school educational institutions developing in three directions--the branch college, the branch college trying to serve the functions of a community college, and the technical college. He saw this situation as expensive and unsound. He voted yes on the proposals of the Gloughter Commission, but with reservations based on the fear that some people would be content to 'settle for a system of technical schools'(77).*

Virginia Polytechnic Institute's president T. Marshall Hahn objected to the separate systems of branch colleges

---

*Senator Paul Burns was also present at the interview. He concurred with Senator Bird.

and technical colleges on philosophical grounds. While admitting that the dual system gave students both technical education and university-parallel curriculums, he noted that "the problem gets to be an intangible one and relates to the fact that there is considerable status and prestige associated with college enrollment." Hahn feared that, although the technical schools included the word "college" in their title, it was likely that technical education would be viewed as less desirable than that received at a branch college. "If there is a dual system, and one is essentially a second-class system or a blue-collar system, you will find that you do not get the potential enrollment in the technical colleges and the technical programs." As mentioned earlier, Hahn felt that the branches were too selective in their admission requirements. While realizing that Virginia Polytechnic Institute was in no way anxious to give up its branches, Hahn concluded that "without any question, the community colleges would be in the state's best interest" (79).

Former Delegate Kathryn H. Stone, a liberal Democrat from Arlington and an enthusiastic supporter of the movement for more technical education, also saw the need for more liberal arts offerings in the local areas. She was confident that, if Virginia could establish a good system of technical schools, the liberal arts would come later. She had given some study to the community college movement on the national scene and feared that Virginia, if it started with a comprehensive system, would give too much emphasis to the college-parallel side of the picture. In the final analysis, however, she saw the system of technical colleges as a stepping-stone to the comprehensive community college (89).

Carter O. Lowance, Executive Assistant to six

Virginia governors, including Governor Godwin, concluded that the 1964 General Assembly recognized the need of more and more students for terminal programs rather than for four-year degrees. He felt that "the technical colleges were intended to meet that immediate need" (82), but, from the time the technical colleges were established, the idea for a comprehensive system of two-year colleges began to take form. Lowance maintained that the experience with the technical colleges opened up the possibilities of developing a broader curriculum. Their own technical college experience, coupled with the experience of other states, showed Virginians "the merit of a community college system" (82).*

Dana B. Hamel, presently the Chancellor of the Virginia Community College System, was Director of Roanoke Technical Institute (a branch under V.P.I.) during the time the Slaughter Commission was conducting its investigation. At that time, Hamel expressed the belief that the state needed a comprehensive community college system. This, he felt, would avoid proliferation of buildings and waste of funds (80). His remarks take on added significance when one considers that Roanoke Technical Institute was located across the highway from a site to be used for the development of a University of Virginia Extension Center (64:60).

Delegate Slaughter, adding to what he had endorsed in his commission, noted that, if the system of technical colleges was left to stand alone, it would mean that the branches would also have to be continued. Moreover, the area vocational schools would have to be maintained to meet the needs of areas without technical schools. This meant that the state

---

*Lowance is no longer with the Governor's office.

was developing three systems of post-high school education. Slaughter felt that "by utilizing the comprehensive community college, we (would be) able to have one system instead of three. You either had this alternative--one system or three--or a combination to make it two--or simply not get the job done." Slaughter saw the technical colleges as the skeleton on which the flesh of the community college system could be grown (87).

Had individuals in the various areas of the state carefully read the Guide for the Establishment of Technical Colleges in Virginia, they would have noted that it did not endorse a college within commuting distance of every individual. The Guide states:

> Although it would be desirable to locate a Technical College near every Virginia high school graduate who does not live within a reasonable commuting distance of an established public or private institution, it is not economically possible nor educationally feasible to do so. In the first place, the State cannot afford that many institutions; and in the second place, small institutions cannot offer the comprehensive curriculum that the very nature of the Technical College demands. Therefore, it is necessary to establish these institutions in areas containing enough potential students to insure a successful operation (43:13-14).

As suggested by various individuals, the comprehensive community college would have been more economical (for the state as a whole) than the continuation of the technical colleges and the other systems. Furthermore, the people in the state who did not get a technical college would surely have demanded some other form of post-high school education. The comprehensive community college system would make this possible, for it advocated a college within commuting

distance of virtually every Virginian.

Mills E. Godwin, Jr., Lieutenant Governor under Harrison, was elected Governor in 1965. His first major policy address to the General Assembly (1966) outlined his plan for extending the base of higher education in the state. He first called for a statewide sales tax that would allow the state to move toward the goal of offering every child in the state an opportunity for a quality education (42:4,5).* It was worth noting that the governor, speaking of all education, saw it as involving the political, social, and economic segments of society.

Speaking directly on higher education, Governor Godwin asked whether the state could afford college for every Virginian who could benefit from it. He felt that the 1966-68 budget presented to the General Assembly would permit widening the base of higher education through the existing branch colleges and also that, by "counting on the almost incredible speed with which the Department of Technical Education has moved, you will have materially enlarged the opportunities for a specialized education in fields where jobs in industry are waiting." Even with the branches and the technical colleges, however, Godwin believed that post-high school education in the state would "have done well by the capable student in the upper half of his class in a large and well-endowed high school." The governor told the legislators that "(you) have a right to be proud of your accomplishments in these separate directions, but, realistically, they must be measured against Virginia's total needs, as intelligently as we can project them" (42:7). Certainly the words "separate directions" must be considered extremely

---

*Governor Harrison, in his final address to the Assembly, had called for a statewide sales tax similar to Godwin's (46c:10).

significant in the governor's address for, as has been shown, various individuals in the state did not want two-year post-high school education to travel down several paths--paths that led ultimately to one goal: a diversified program of post-high school education for as many as could profit from it.

Godwin's proposal was the development of the statewide system of community colleges. He viewed the comprehensive community college as "more than a decapitated four-year college. It is more than a merger of technical and two-year branch colleges in the interest of economy, although it embraces all of these concepts" (42:7). In defining just what Virginia's comprehensive community college was to be, if adopted as he advocated, Governor Godwin was taking a major step in expanding and democratizing high school education. In his policy address (1966) to the General Assembly, the governor defined the comprehensive community college as follows:

> It is a varied and flexible institution, tailored to community needs and designed to serve every citizen within commuting distance.
> It offers universal admission to high school graduates, weighs their potential through extensive guidance and testing, and directs them to their proper field of study.
> It relieves the pressure on our four-year resident institutions at a fraction of their cost per student.
> It substitutes informed choice for the guesswork that so often selects a college for the high school graduate.
> It minimizes the heartache and provides new opportunity for the amazing number of four-year college freshmen who are unable to complete their first year, despite the best admission machinery.
> It offers a second chance to high school graduates who have been refused admittance to the college of their first choice, as well as to those who would have little chance of enrolling in any four-year college (42:7-8).

Godwin, recognizing the branch and technical colleges as important steps in higher education, expressed his belief that, through building on them, the legislators could insure that three-fourths of the college-age population could attend a comprehensive community college. Further, through using the proposed sales tax, the General Assembly could, in the next biennium, "provide college exposure for our high school graduates throughout the entire length and breadth of this State." He believed that "a system of true community colleges will blanket the education area between high school and the four-year college" (42:8).*

Governor Godwin, then, in his first major address on what he hoped to accomplish in his administration, gave a high priority to the development of a statewide system of comprehensive community colleges. He never lost sight of the fact that the technical colleges and branches of the major institutions provided the intermediate steps in his plan for comprehensive community colleges.

In commenting on the steps Virginia had taken, Godwin contended that "while we have been thinking big, we have not been thinking big enough." He maintained that the technical colleges had started to meet the needs of the state, but that they met neither the needs of those students who wanted to gain entrance to four-year institutions nor the needs of industry for young men of executive ability (25f). Godwin believed that "as the technical colleges progressed, . . . educators

---

*In the portion of his address dealing with the comprehensive community college, Godwin gave credit to the Virginia Higher Education Study Commission for influencing his thinking in this area of education. The 1965 Brumbaugh study was a part of the commission's final report.

found that the students wanted 'more than just technical skills' and that the new, sophisticated industries wanted well-rounded and fully-developed young technicians" (25e). To Governor Godwin, in the formative days of his administration, "thinking big" meant the establishment of a two-year system of comprehensive community colleges.

All evidence suggests that the development of the statewide system of community colleges in Virginia was indeed an evolutionary process; and certainly an evolution, like a revolution, demands leaders if it is to succeed. Key leaders had to make key decisions for the community colleges to come into being. Some of them have already been mentioned, but others were also instrumental in the process.

Governor Harrison deserves a great deal of credit for making possible the expanded base of post-high school education in the state; his administration covered the years of transition. The state was moving from a rural society into one with most of its population living in urban centers. Moreover, his emphasis on industrial development made it necessary for the state to recognize the need for more technicians. Senator Bird, while doubting that Harrison envisioned a comprehensive community college system, gives him credit for asking for the comprehensive study of higher education that was published in 1965.

Carter O. Lowance notes the importance of Harrison's administration in the formative years of the community college system (82). Dana Hamel also gives him credit for the development of the community colleges. He sees Harrison as the person who sowed the seeds that later burst forth as the comprehensive community colleges (80).

Perhaps Governor Harrison's greatest contribution to the development of a statewide system was that he

was constantly looking ahead. He had the benefit of a comprehensive analysis of the need for technical education in the form of the Slaughter Commission's report. He had, in fact, secured legislation for establishing a system of technical colleges during his administration. It would have been easy--and it surely must have been tempting--for Governor Harrison to assume during his administration that the direction of post-high school education in Virginia had been settled, but he refused to rest on his laurels and proceeded to support a further study of higher education.

Another person more interested in higher education than laurels was Delegate D. French Slaughter. Slaughter had done well as the chairman of the Commission on Vocational Education. Even though he could have retired from the higher education scene and been proud of his accomplishments, he chose not to do so. He believed in his commission's recommendation concerning a statewide system of community colleges, and, in the floor discussion of the Community College Bill, he "managed the Godwin bill" in the House of Delegates (26a). He was unselfish and untiring in his fight for the movement to democratize higher education in the state.

T. Marshall Hahn, President of Virginia Polytechnic Institute gave impetus to the movement through his willingness to cooperate in the creation of the community colleges. Senator Bird was "pleasantly surprised" when Hahn offered his full cooperation in the establishment of the system of community colleges (77). Early in the debate over the community colleges, the V.P.I. Board of Visitors' executive committee supported the colleges. One editor declared that "we can be sure that Dr. Hahn had a strong hand in making the decision." The editor further stated that Hahn was "willing to look beyond his own campus and its needs and goals to the welfare and progress of the state

as a whole" (29c). Had the presidents of the University of Virginia and The College of William and Mary publicly given the same support, it is conceivable that Hahn would be considered less of a key person in the movement.

Senator Lloyd C. Bird emerged as a leading force in the movement toward a statewide system of community colleges. In choosing Bird to head the Virginia Higher Education Study Commission that made its report in 1965, Governor Harrison had a sound basis for his choice, for he

> . . . regarded Bird as one of the most knowledgeable, interested and dedicated men we have in public service in Virginia. He is a person who has interested himself in anything that concerned the State of Virginia. He has been on the Southern Regional Education Board ever since it came into being; he probably knows as much of what is happening in the field of higher education as any non-professional educator in the State of Virginia. He had the interest and ability to do a job, and more than that, he was willing to undertake it and work at it day and night (81).

Delegate Slaughter feels that a large share of the credit should be given to Senator Lloyd C. Bird for the development of the community colleges (87). Others also mentioned Bird's key role in the development of the system. He was and is a respected member of the General Assembly and is still interested in higher education. His services were invaluable in the movement toward democratizing higher education in the state. Like other legislators, he was not content with the status quo and worked for change.

Governor Godwin must stand high among those who wanted a comprehensive community college system. He accepted the conclusions of the Virginia Higher Education Study Commission and made its recommendations

an important part of his legislative program. Slaughter was "doubtful that we would have gotten this system when we did, without Governor Godwin's support. His support was indispensable. If he had not picked the thing up, I do not know where we would have been today" (87).

Governor Harrison magnanimously gave credit to his successor in office. In commenting on Godwin's contributions, he stated:

> I think Governor Godwin has done a tremendous job in marshalling sentiment for the community college system. The first two years of his administration were spent by him going all over the State selling the idea. It is all very fine to create something, but unless you can command universal support for it, then it could very well fail. Some say I created it (the community college system), but Governor Godwin has taken the ball and marshalled and solidified the support for this system (81).

T. Edward Temple (Director of the Division of State Planning and Community Affairs at the time he was interviewed, and earlier a member of the Bird Commission) declared that it took an all-out effort by Governor Godwin to bring about the development of the community colleges. "I would say that without the support of the Governor--if he had been less enthusiastic--the community college system would never have gotten off the ground" (91).

Dana B. Hamel feels that, although Governor Harrison "planted the seeds" for the community colleges, Governor Godwin cultivated them and made them grow (80).

One could point to other evidence of Godwin's key role in the development of the community college, but the foregoing is enough to show his willingness to put his administration on record early as favoring it. Without his support, as others have pointed out, it is

highly unlikely that the system of community colleges would have emerged when it did.

Dana B. Hamel, a professional educator, became Director of Roanoke Technical Institute in 1963. In September 1964, he was appointed the first Director of the Department of Technical Education. On May 9, 1966, Governor Godwin named him head of the new system of community colleges to go into operation on July 1 of that year. From his arrival in the field of Virginia higher education, Hamel felt that the state should move toward a comprehensive system of community colleges. He told the Slaughter Commission this in 1963 (80). As Governor Godwin described Hamel, his choice for the Directorship of the Department of Community Colleges, he "has a tremendously distinguished record in the liberal arts (and) is one who also now is making a tremendous record in technical education" (27n).

Delegate Slaughter described Hamel as instrumental in the development of a system of comprehensive community colleges. Speaking of Hamel, Slaughter says:

> He was enthusiastic toward the idea; he understood it and he understood how it should be operated and this was very important--you can imagine that if you had a director who was sold on technical education only, and opposed to the community college concept that a lot of people would have wondered about our recommendations. He is really a comprehensive man himself (87).

Like Harrison and Slaughter, Hamel was unwilling to settle for only a good system of technical colleges; he wanted a further look at two-year colleges in Virginia--a more comprehensive approach to post-high school education. Since he was a "comprehensive man," he played a major role in bringing about the comprehensive college.

The State Council of Higher Education deserves credit for helping to create this system. As pointed

out earlier, the council went on record as favoring more diversity in two-year colleges. Under the directorship of Prince B. Woodard, it was responsible for selecting the professional staff for the Higher Education Study Commission that recommended the development of a statewide system of community colleges. This study was directed by John Dale Russell and included A. J. Brumbaugh and William J. McGlothlin in its staff. As coordinating agency for the commission's study, the State Council of Higher Education was important to its success.

The Virginia Higher Education Study Commission provided much of the documentation that convinced Governor Godwin and the legislators that their approach to post-high school education was not only feasible but also highly desirable. An especially important section in the commission's report was the one by A. J. Brumbaugh, dealing entirely with the two-year college in the state. Brumbaugh made recommendations on how the state should proceed in its future planning for the goal of a comprehensive system of community colleges (35:1-27). Prince B. Woodard gives the Higher Education Study Commission primary credit and responsibility for the establishment of the Virginia community college system (93).

One influence on the development of the Virginia community college system came from beyond the state's borders--the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB). Through its Commission on Goals for Higher Education in the South, it recommended that each SREB member state develop a strong system of two-year community colleges. The commission expressed the belief that the "community college is economical for both students and taxpayers. It can be responsive to local needs and a vital force in the community" (62:6).

Senator Bird credits the SREB with first kindling

his interest in the comprehensive community college movement. In fact, he suggests that one reason he was chosen to head the Virginia Higher Education Study Commission was his earlier membership in the SREB (77). Governor Harrison, when asked if the SREB influenced his thinking on the comprehensive two-year college, replied "Yes, without a doubt." He praised the SREB for providing professional staff to do studies throughout the South (81).*

Certainly those mentioned are not all the key people in the Virginia junior college movement. Eugene B. Sydnor, who served as chairman of the State Board of Technical Education and became the chairman of the State Board for Community Colleges, deserves credit for working to make the transition possible. The other four members** who served on both boards also deserve credit for their advice and guidance during the transition period, as does, obviously, everyone else who served on the Slaughter and Bird Commissions. Yet all of them serve to demonstrate that the community college system was part of the evolution of higher education in the state. No one person here discussed, with the possible exceptions of Hamel and Hahn and some of the consultants, was a newcomer to the Virginia scene. Without the roots into the past, it is unlikely that Virginia would have taken the step that called not for a break with the past, but for progress toward the democratization of post-high school education in the state.

---

*Brumbaugh was a consultant for the SREB at the time he did the Virginia study.

**William P. Kanto, S. E. Liles, Jr., Henry W. Tulloch, and Gordon C. Willis.

Part V

ACTION AND REACTION: THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A COMMUNITY COLLEGE SYSTEM

Just as the movement toward a statewide system of community colleges in Virginia was gradual and not a distinct break with the past, so the development of the colleges was a part of the movement toward the democratization of post-high school education in the state. The 1966 law creating the community college system was written to provide more opportunities for post-high school education for more Virginians. The people close to the scene--consultants, legislators, educators, and citizens--tended to support the democratization concept and to visualize a statewide system developed largely at the state's expense, rather than one developed as a wholly local project. As has been suggested, the community colleges were to be comprehensive, allowing the students a choice--a choice that, for the most part, was not provided in the branch and technical colleges.

The highly important Brumbaugh study (1965) had recommended that the community colleges be statewide, comprehensive, and publicly supported. It had also called for a single board to be responsible for their establishment and control. Brumbaugh emphasized that educational opportunities must be available to all Virginians who could profit from them (35:5-9).

The 1965 Report of the Higher Education Study Commission to the Governor and the General Assembly of Virginia (with which the Higher Education Study Commission and John Dale Russell, Director of the Study, concurred) recommended that

> . . . steps should be taken immediately to transfer the two-year branches of the state-controlled higher institutions, post-high

> school area-vocational school programs, and the two-year technical colleges, to the proposed State Board for Community Colleges. George Mason College and Christopher Newport College, both of which are well along toward being converted to four-year degree-granting institutions, should be held in their present status until there is a final decision about developing them as four-year institutions (64:27).

The attitudes toward the development of community colleges that would absorb many of the branches and technical schools were not, however, uniform. In fact, the legislative battle lines were distinct and a compromise had to be effected before the final community college bill passed the General Assembly.

The community college bill that reached the floor of the House and the Senate departed from the recommendations of the Virginia Higher Education Study Commission. The commission had excluded only two branches--George Mason in Northern Virginia, a branch of the University of Virginia, and Christopher Newport in Newport News, a branch of The College of William and Mary, but Governor Godwin found it expedient to exclude three other two-year branches from the bill he presented to the legislators. He excluded the university's branch in Wise, Virginia Polytechnic Institute's branch in Danville, and William and Mary's branch in Petersburg.

Godwin, who had agreed with the original findings of the Higher Education Study Commission, was a realist in the political arena. He remarked that he "would be happy if the General Assembly would approve the community college system with these three institutions in it," but, since this seemed unlikely, he admitted that "we are dealing here not with Utopia. Even with these three exemptions we have the basis for a fine community college system" (27h).

Even the exclusion of the additional three branches did not insure a smooth passage for the community college bill. In the House of Delegates, for example, George N. McMath of the Eastern Shore offered an amendment that would allow local option in deciding whether or not a branch college was to become a part of the community college system. McMath asked that each branch college named in the bill be allowed to "have the option to remain independent of the control and administration of the State Board for Community Colleges upon obtaining the consent of the governing body of the college or university of which such institution is a part . . . ." (54b:306). Although the McMath amendment was rejected, the fight in the Senate was not over.

McMath's purpose in introducing the amendment was to keep the Eastern Shore branch under the control of the University of Virginia. He was not the only one to take this stand. Delegate A. L. Philpott, who was interested in the future of the university branch in his own district (Patrick Henry), stated that "we do not know whteher we are relegating our children to educational mediocrity." Aware of the drawing power of the university, Philpott stated that "we believe the prestige of the University of Virginia is essential to get instructors" (28e). Like McMath, Philpott felt that the legislators should take a hard look at the feelings in each community before forcing a branch to become a member of the community college system (28e).

Philpott was not the only one to recognize the "drawing power" of being connected with a major university. The chairman of the Wytheville Community College's board (a branch of Virginia Polytechnic Institute) opposed putting all Virginia's two-year colleges under one central board. He used the argument that the V.P.I. name helped the school recruit better faculty (28d).

Sherman P. Dutton, Director of the Patrick Henry branch of the University of Virginia, also felt that, if Patrick Henry were no longer connected with the University, he would have a more difficult time recruiting faculty, especially out-of-state faculty members (78).

Other delegates raised the question of whether the new community colleges could receive accreditation. In answer, Delegate Slaughter, who was guiding the bill through the House, assured them that "there is absolutely no problem as far as accreditation is concerned." He based his statement on the belief that the colleges would be well financed and that thus "quality education" would be insured (78). The Godwin bill passed the House by a vote of ninety-four to zero (54b:306).* The House fight was minor, but the bill did not pass unscathed in the Senate.

The Governor, while realizing that the exclusion of the three branches--Clinch Valley at Wise, Richard Bland College at Petersburg, and Danville Community College--was "a compromise to see his plan through" (27i), perhaps did not see the immediate reaction to his compromise plan. It was anticipated that George Mason would become a four-year institution (since the Higher Education Study Commission had recommended one for the Northern Virginia area), but it was not so clear that the university's branch in Wise would seek four-year status. (The commission recommended that it become a part of the community college system.) However, an amendment added to the bill calling for George Mason to assume four-year status also called for Clinch Valley College in Wise to become a four-year college. The original bill and the amendment passed without major opposition, but there was a

---

*Philpott and McMath abstained from the voting. Four other members were not present for the voting, but they had expressed no opposition to the community college bill.

movement in the Senate to exclude both the Eastern Shore and Patrick Henry branches of the university from the community college system.

The fight in the Senate was led by Senators William F. Stone of Martinsville and E. Almer Ames of the Eastern Shore. Stone made it clear that he wanted the bill amended to exclude Patrick Henry from the community college system. "I'm utterly amazed at the exemption of some colleges and the inclusion of others," he told newsmen. He insisted that "we (Patrick Henry) want to remain a part of a prestige institution" (29d). In an interview, he remarked that "our people feel very definitely that they like the prestige that goes with . . . the University's umbrella. The University of Virginia has already had its accreditation assured for the next ten years and, needless to say, we come under it" (90).

While insisting that he was not opposed to the community college system, Stone still felt strongly that local option should prevail in deciding which schools should join it.

> I think the State has a moral--even a legal obligation--to let us remain a part of the University of Virginia because we came along before the community college system and we want to stay under their accreditation umbrella. If the time comes when the community college system has the same kind of accreditation that our school has by reason of its connections with the University of Virginia, then I would not be adverse to the idea of our joining the system with the exception that I do not want Patrick Henry College to ever become a technical school. No, I am not against the community college program. I do object to the way it was handled. They did not ask us if we wanted to become a part of the community college program. They did, in effect, tell us we had to be. Nobody wants to be told what he has to do and for that reason Senator Ames and myself got enough votes to prevent it and we effected a compromise (90).

Stone also pointed out that local citizens and the area governments had put their own financial resources into the development of Patrick Henry.

Senator Ames was just as adamant as Stone. After the Godwin bill passed the House, Ames remarked that "we haven't given up yet" in the fight to have local option determine the fate of the branch colleges (28f). Besides the accreditation issue raised by Stone, Ames feared that, under the community college system, the Eastern Shore branch would lose its financial support and its ties with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (28f), which has an important installation on the Eastern Shore's Wallops Island. (Delegate McMath had expressed the same fears concerning NASA.)

One editorial suggested that while "pleas for (the branches) remaining under the aegis of the University were quite properly rejected in the House of Delegates, . . . the Governor has been reluctant to force the issue in the Senate, presumably because of the influence enjoyed by Sen. William Stone of Martinsville and Sen. Almer Ames of Onancock" (28h). Stone and Ames, however, did force the issue and got results. They effected a compromise that provided a delaying action for moving the branches in their areas into the community college system. The community college law, as enacted by the General Assembly, stated that:

> . . . no such transfer shall take place with respect to any individual institution specified in the next preceding paragraph (which included the Eastern Shore and Martinsville branches) until the Advisory Committee on Community Colleges certifies to the State Board and the Governor that such individual institution has demonstrated the requirements necessary for accreditation by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (32:1139).

The compromise amendment was effected after a three-hour meeting in the governor's office. In attendance at

the meeting were the presidents of the University of Virginia, Virginia Polytechnic Institute, and William and Mary (28i). Governor Godwin stated that the amendment was "drawn to strengthen the bill and give reassurance to the communities concerned that they will continue to have quality programs of education" when their branches become a part of the community college system (26c). Nevertheless, as one writer suggested, "the amendment represents at least a partial victory for Sen. William F. Stone of Martinsville and Sen. Almar Ames of the Eastern Shore . . ." (28i). This is shown by the fact that both Ames and Stone, who had vigorously opposed the inclusion of the branches in their areas, agreed to the changes (27j) and the community college bill passed the Senate by a unanimous vote. The House gave its approval to the amendment by a vote of eighty-two to zero, including "yeas" by McMath and Philpott (54b:1114).

The compromise led the chairman of the local board of Patrick Henry to remark that "we have every reason to believe that our ties with the university will remain until 1969. Even then we are not anxious to break away" (29j). The chairman saw little change being forced on Patrick Henry: "I see no reason why our financial dominoes cannot fall into place as envisioned prior to the time that the community college concept arose" (28j).

Furthermore, the compromise allowed time for the Eastern Shore Branch to pursue its attempt to be excluded from the community college system. During the General Assembly session, McMath had pointed out that the federal government had given the university a gift of land and a $380,000 development grant, on condition that the university operate a branch college on it. Under the Community College Act, parent institutions were to deed to the state the property of the branches to be brought into the community college system. If the Eastern Shore branch went into the community college

it might be breaking its agreement with the federal government (30d).

Was the compromise on the accreditation issue necessary? One editor, suggesting that the entire community college plan was in danger unless the governor intervened, felt that the system of community colleges was vital to the state. He also felt that it was going to fail because

> Provincial politics has reared its ugly head in the Virginia General Assembly, with the result that the all-important comprehensive system of community colleges envisioned for Virginia is in danger of being wrecked. It is high time for GOVERNOR GODWIN to exert his leadership in this matter of which he is capable (27g).

Another editor raised the question, "What Kind of Community College?" He wanted to know the status of the new community colleges in transfer and accreditation.

> Before Virginia embarks on a spending program for this new concept in colleges, and, even more important, before it lumps its present proven branch colleges with the new creatures, these are questions (transfer and accreditation status) that should be raised and answered (30a).

The amended bill, then, assuaged the fears of that editor through guaranteeing that the branches would be eligible for accreditation and the students for transfer.

T. Marshall Hahn felt that the compromise amendment "strengthens what is already a good bill" (28j). He, like the governor, obviously wanted to see a community college system created.

Another editor observed that, "despite the complications, we are convinced that a statewide system of coordinated community colleges is in the best interest

of the state and its people" (29g). One complication had been getting the community college bill through the Senate--the amendment expedited this action.

Some segments of the public reacted against the exclusion of certain branches from the community college system. One editorial stated that the governor, through allowing some branches to stay out of the system, had "perhaps only succeeded in inviting collapse of the entire plan" (28c). This view was endorsed by an important Richmond newspaper, which reprinted the entire article on its own editorial page.* Another editor chided the General Assembly for its "irresponsible action" in deciding which branches should be included in the system and which should not, and wanted the General Assembly to follow the recommendations of the Higher Education Study Commission. Unless it did, the writer believed, "Virginia's high hopes for a genuine statewide system of community colleges will be dashed to pieces on the rocks of politics and sectionalism" (29e). While admitting that, in its view, the legislation establishing a system of community colleges was "short of being ideal," the same paper nevertheless felt that the "way at least is paved for establishment of an excellent community college system" (29i).

Although the compromise amendment was apparently necessary to bring enough branches into the community college system to provide a solid base for its development under one board, one writer noted that, "If further exceptions are made, . . . the whole scheme for a unified and coordinated higher education system will be wrecked" (29f). The fact that the compromise amendment was added indicates that the bill was in trouble; the fact that Stone and Ames agreed to it indicates

---

*The Richmond-Times Dispatch reprinted the entire editorial in its February 8, 1966, issue.

that the amendment allowed the bill to move quickly. Governor Godwin frankly stated that his original community college bill was not utopian (27h), and one can readily see that the General Assembly in 1966 was no Utopia in which to present a bill. It was rather a legislative body of free men expressing what they considered to be the wishes of their constituents. In such a situation, compromise is not only expedient, but also necessary, if the legislative process is to function in open debate.

The community college also received some opposition from the vocational-technical schools, which, although they did not receive as much attention in the General Assembly as the branches did, had their own advocates at the local levels. Augusta County officials, for instance, wondered what effect the new community colleges would have on the vocational-technical school in their area. The consensus was that county government and school officials "would not look kindly at any move to transfer the control" of the area school to Richmond (23c).

Stiffer opposition was voiced by officials at the New River Vocational-Technical School in Radford, who said they "would fight to avoid being taken over by the community college board" (28g). The director of the Radford institution, aware that the community college board was going to take over only post-high school vocational-technical education, stated that "it may be necessary to abandon post-high school and adult classes at Vo-Tech to avoid being taken over by the community college board." The director feared that the community colleges would raise the level of vocational-technical education to such a degree that it would deny many students entrance to the college (28g). The post-high school curriculums of the area vocational schools were indeed to be absorbed by the community colleges and

provide the basis for many of their occupational-technical programs.

On April 6, 1966, the General Assembly repealed those sections of the Code of Virginia that had created the Department of Technical Education and the State Board of Technical Education. In their place, the legislators created a Department of Community Colleges and a State Board for Community Colleges. The colleges, as members of the Department of Community Colleges, were to be comprehensive. The law defined a comprehensive community college as follows:

> 'Comprehensive Community College' means an institution of higher education which offers instruction in one or more of the following fields:
>
> (1) freshman and sophomore courses in arts and sciences acceptable for transfer in baccalaureate degree programs,
> (2) diversified technical curricula including programs leading to the associate degree,
> (3) vocational and technical education leading directly to employment,
> (4) courses in general and continuing education for adults in the above fields.

The State Board for Community Colleges was given the authority to "promulgate necessary rules and regulations" for carrying out the purposes of the comprehensive community colleges. The board was to determine the need for their establishment and to draw up a statewide master plan for their location and schedule of development.

The law provided for the transfer of seven of the branch colleges and all post-high school programs of the area vocational and technical schools to the System of Community Colleges. The vocational and technical schools were to come into the system on July 1, 1966. The branches were scheduled to come in on July 1, 1967, but could enter the system earlier if the State Board for Community Colleges

and the governing board of the college or university of which the branch was a part so agreed.

The law creating the community college system established the office of Director of Community Colleges. He was to work with the board in carrying out the procedures necessary to implement the policies and rules for the operation of the system (32:1136-41).

On September 28, 1966, the State Board for Community Colleges adopted Policies, Procedures, and Regulations for the system, and defined a community college as

> . . . a comprehensive institution of higher education offering programs of instruction generally extending not more than two years beyond the high school level, which shall include, but not be limited to, courses in occupational and technical fields, the liberal arts and sciences, general education, continuing adult education, pre-college and pre-technical preparatory programs, special training programs to meet the economic needs of the region in which the college is located, and other services to meet the cultural and educational needs of this region (57).

The board broadened its definition of a community college to include pre-college and pre-technical work and special training programs to meet the needs of industry, with the full intention of providing a system of comprehensive community colleges for the state.

This same board was to be responsible for determining tuition and fees. (The tuition cost to students, while not spelled out in this first edition of Policies, was set at forty-five dollars per quarter for full-time Virginia students.)*

In January 1967, a proposed master plan for the statewide system of community colleges was published.

---

*At the present time, tuition costs are sixty dollars per quarter for full-time Virginia students.

The plan, prepared under the direction of consultant Eric Rhodes, called for the establishment of twenty-two community colleges across the state. This would put one within commuting distance of every citizen in the state. In areas with large populations and in some rural areas, the Rhodes Study called for multi-campus community colleges (59).*

The definition of a comprehensive community college as set forth by the law creating the system and as defined by the State Board for Community Colleges recognized the need for a diverse program. The Rhodes and Brumbaugh studies, in recommending that a community college be within commuting distance of every citizen, acknowledged the fact that all Virginians (even those living in areas such as Charlottesville, the home of the University of Virginia) could profit from the diverse offerings of the comprehensive community college. The two conditions combined--the broad definition and a college within commuting distance of all citizens--provided a greater number of Virginians with a chance to go to college and made the democratization of higher education more feasible than it had ever been before. Strangely, though, the reactions to this statewide system were mixed.

One major feature of the new system of community colleges was that, if developed according to the master plan, they were to be located in every area of the state. The law establishing the colleges stated that they were to be controlled by the State Board for Community Colleges. This writer asked a number of people close to the community college scene if they accepted the idea of a statewide system of community colleges under the central control of one board.

T. Edward Temple, whose primary responsibility as Director of State Planning and Community Affairs is to

---

*The master plan was, for the most part, accepted as recommended by Rhodes.

plan for the entire state, stated that the Higher Education Study Commission (of which he was a member) never seriously considered recommending any other plan. Temple had grave doubts whether many areas in the state could effectively develop a community college without state aid. Furthermore, he sees the State Board for Community Colleges as necessary for the development of a uniform system. (He used the word "uniform" to indicate that certain features are common to all community colleges, rather than that all colleges should be alike.) Speaking of the democratization potential of the community colleges, Temple was "wholly in accord with the concept that there should be a community college within commuting distance of every single boy and girl in the state of Virginia" (91).

Prince Woodard also subscribed to a statewide system of community colleges, believing that a college not only can bring industry to a region, but also create a demand for a more diverse program at the college. Woodard supports a system under one general board, but feels that local boards should also exercise a certain degree of control in their respective areas (93).

Delegate Kathryn Stone, echoing sentiments similar to those of Baker Brownell (4), saw a statewide system as a means of preventing the "population drain" from certain rural counties. This population loss, Stone maintained, was more than just a loss of numbers; it was the loss of leadership potential (89).

Dana Hamel, from his knowledge in the field of higher education, realized that the national trend was toward statewide systems of community colleges. He was also aware that, from a political, social, and economic point of view, it was desirable to provide post-high school education for the whole state. Hamel, who sees the community college as a major step toward democratization of higher education, feels that a statewide system, receiving most of its support from state funds, is absolutely necessary if the poorer sections of the state are to have an equal

opportunity to get an education (80).

Delegate D. French Slaughter, when asked if he felt the state should develop all the colleges called for in the master plan, replied that he felt "very strongly that we should go with the twenty-two colleges of the system which would enable us to place a college within commuting distance of every community in the state. This is one of the really indispensable ideas behind the community college system" (87).* In commenting on the fact that the State Department and State Board were to exercise central control over the system, Slaughter observed that the system should have a great deal of flexibility. "In Lee, Scott, and Wise (highly rural counties), for example, if the demand is for transfer students and you do not have a single demand for a technical course, then this is all right--we should offer what the students need in the region." Slaughter, who was past Vice-Chairman of Public Education, did not consider recommending that the technical or community colleges be placed under the Board of Public Education. He felt a separate board was needed to strengthen the point that the community colleges were to be higher--not secondary--education (87).

The issue of whether or not the statewide system was best for Virginia was not always clear-cut. W. Roy Smith favored it in the beginning, but felt that the concept of a "system" got off the track when institutions began competing with one another. Delegate Smith, who represented the area of Richard Bland College, a division of William and Mary, felt that the system approach was destroyed when the decision was made to locate John Tyler Technical College (later John Tyler Community College) within commuting distance of Richard Bland College, for this competition, Smith maintained, hurt the statewide

---

*One member of the Slaughter Commission, Curry Carter, wanted to keep the State Board of Education as the controlling board for the technical colleges. Carter primarily feared a proliferation of state agencies.

philosophy. He did, however, strongly favor a separate board for the community colleges (88).

Governor Harrison, who accepted the recommendation for twenty-two colleges (or more if the need arose), thought the localities should provide more capital outlay. Although he felt that everyone would want a community college if the state were to pay the bill, he also believed that, if the localities were to furnish the land and the buildings, the growth would be more orderly and the college more a part of the community. He acknowledged the further likelihood that some localities, unable to provide local funds, would be deprived of a community college. Thus, he asserted, need should be the primary criterion for establishing a community college. "Need" meant that the college's "location will justify the expenditures by the State." Harrison was in complete agreement that surveys should be used to determine where the colleges should be located: "I don't think any college should be located in an area simply because some politically important person or group wants one" (81).

One writer called the system the "egalitarianism of higher education" and felt that "a broadened, or democratic, concept of collegiate education is a new departure for Virginia" (27k). Another editorial called the community colleges "an important milestone on the road to adequate development of Virginia's educational and industrial potential . . ." and pointed to the cultural values of allowing more Virginians to go on to post-high school education (27m). The fact that more students could get more education was called both a "boom and a burden" by T. Marshall Hahn. He believed the system was badly needed, but cautioned that, by giving more students the opportunity to go to college, later enrollments at the already crowded four-year institutions would substanially increase (26b).

A feature writer entitled one of her articles "Community Colleges Called Boon to Women." It was written in response to a speech by Governor Godwin in which he told the Virginia Federation of Women's Clubs that the new community college system should encourage more women to enter or re-enter professions for which there was a shortage of practitioners in the state. The governor held out the colleges as a way to alleviate the loneliness that women often suffer after their children are in school or are grown (27L).

Virginia's Superintendent of Public Instruction stated that the system was needed to avoid duplication in the field of vocational education. He maintained that "obviously there had to be some coordinating body" (27p). This endorsement was needed if the system was effectively to take over all post-high school vocational education.

One member of the House of Delegates (Willis Anderson, Roanoke) used the development of the community college system as a point of departure in arguing for lower tuition rates at all state-supported institutions of higher education (29k). Another delegate (J. Warren White) proposed "that consideration be given to dropping the tuition charge for in-state students (22).* One editor, who basically agreed with the proposal to eliminate fees, referred to the Virginia plan as its "Pay-as-You-Go-to-College" plan (30f). Another simply pleaded that the fees be standardized at all the community colleges (29L).**

---

*The editor did not agree with White's stand on tuition.

**At first, it appeared as if Roanoke's community college would have a higher fee structure than the one in Northern Virginia; this, however, was not the case. Both colleges had tuition charges of $45 a quarter for full-time Virginia students.

Perhaps the strongest criticism of the low fee structure at the community colleges came from Delegate W. Roy Smith, who wanted to know why students going to a branch college or any other state-supported institution should be charged more than someone attending a community college. Smith believed that the state should not use too many of its resources in one area of development and thereby reduce its ability to do what was needed in others (88). His stand at first appears reasonable, but, since Virginia was a "high tuition" state, raising fees at the community colleges to equal those at other state-supported instituions would be inconsistent with the community college philosophy of making education available to those who previously could not afford it.

Several writers saw the potential of the comprehensive community college for boosting industrial development. One editorial remarked on the "high degree of optimism over locating on the Peninsula one of the Commonwealth's projected new two-year colleges that will train technicians . . ." (20). The Director of Industrial Development, in one of his final speeches before retiring, claimed that some sections of the state "have nothing to sell but a strong back." He did, however, praise current efforts at providing education for technicians (26f).*

Governor Godwin, the first Virginia governor to address a meeting of the state AFL-CIO convention, told the labor leaders of the benefits that would befall labor with the establishment of the community colleges (26g). It is significant that he discussed this point with labor leaders. The obvious implication--that labor could now look toward a system of post-high school

---

*Earlier, the Director had promised that the system of community colleges would offer a "heavy technical program" (30b).

education to serve its needs on a statewide basis--was, in itself, a new concept.

Godwin, addressing the other side of the labor-management picture, also told some two hundred industrial development leaders that industry itself had provided the incentive for developing the system of comprehensive community colleges (26e). Clearly the governor saw the community college as a common meeting ground beneficial to both labor and management.

One editor saw the Special Training Programs Division of the State Department of Community Colleges as an important new approach for training workers in the state. The editor stated:

> So effective has the plan been deemed by General Electric that the company decided to expand its Portsmouth investment of $6 million by $10 million more. This involved the transfer of its entire production of color portable TV sets from Syracuse, N. Y. to Portsmouth.

He concluded that the Special Training Program "is one significant facet of Virginia's establishment of a system of community colleges"(27q).

The reactions to the community college were philosophical as well as practical. The reaction of Senator Stone was philosophically negative. He maintained that he "had no quarrel with the community colleges," but maintained that "you cannot have people learning to operate lathes and all those technical things right along with a good academic setup. You have got to have them divided" (90). Certainly, then, his opposition went much deeper than the fear (as expressed earlier in this study) that the colleges could not become accredited. Interestingly, Sherman Dutton, the Director of the University's branch in Stone's senatorial district, did not object on philosophical grounds. Speaking of

teaching technical and academic subjects in the same building, Dutton pointed out that "the development of comprehensive community colleges in other states will bear out that this can and has been done" (78).

This writer talked to a student who had completed a two-year certificate program at a branch of V.P.I. and his first year in an associate-degree program at the same institution after it had joined the community college system. Asked about his first reaction to the news that the branch was going to join the system, he replied, "I was dismayed . . . that we would lose the quality of the teachers we had while under V.P.I." He admitted, however, that his fears were unfounded and added that the new system was "the greatest thing that has happened to higher education in the state of Virginia." He felt it gave most Virginians an opportunity to get some form of higher education (86).

In 1964, Virginia had twelve privately controlled two-year institutions of higher education. Some of these just happened to be located in Virginia and did not serve their locality. Seven were solely for women students. Only one (the Apprentice School of Newport News Shipbuilding and Dry Dock Company) was for men only and offered any extensive vocational training. Of the seven women's colleges, five admitted less than thirty-one per cent of their students from Virginia. The coeducational institutions and the one male institution all got more than half their students from the state. While over fifty-six per cent of all students in privately controlled two-year colleges came from Virginia, less than twenty per cent came from the local college area (35:46-50). Few of the private two-year colleges were serving the area where they were located. This, of course, was to be the main point of the community colleges.

T. Edward Temple, a member of the board of trustees of Ferrum Junior College (a coeducational two-year college) saw absolutely no conflict between what Ferrum, a church-related college, and the new system were trying to do. Temple, expressing the views of the board, believed that "one was needed to complement the other" (91). Ferrum's new dean, previously dean at a public junior college in Florida, predicted success for the community colleges in Virginia (28L). While Ferrum did not see itself as being affected by the new system, not all the other private colleges reacted the same way.

The now defunct Marion College, a two-year church-related junior college, made overtures to Dana Hamel regarding its becoming a site for a state-supported community college in the new system, but was told that, since Wytheville had a community college and since one was planned for Washington County, the possibility of Marion's getting one was non-existent (75:2). Marion College found itself

> . . . faced with the biggest crisis of its history. Church relationship was in serious trouble again. Economic pressures were making it impossible to pursue accreditation. Compounding the problem was the advent of the Virginia Community College System in 1965 (sic). The state plan called for a community college to be placed to the east and west sides of Marion within twenty-five miles of the institution. Although Marion had been drawing from a wide geographic area for the past twenty years, it was still heavily dependent upon the state and area for fifty per cent of its student body (75:17).*

---

*This and all subsequent information on Marion College (which ceased operation in 1967) is from a yet unpublished history of Marion College by Thomas W. West, former president of the college.

The coming of the comprehensive colleges hastened the demise of Marion College. Certainly it had other troubles, but the new system bolstered the decision to close the college.

Instead of closing, Averett College in Danville decided to become a four-year institution and to admit males as day-students. The president of the college stated that the coming of the community college system definitely influenced its decision. It intended to supplement the new colleges rather than to compete with them (76).

In contrast to Averett, Stratford College, also in Danville, decided to become a four-year institution, but was not influenced by the coming of the publicly supported colleges. The president stated that because Stratford was almost entirely residential and because only about one-fourth of its students came from Virginia, the new system would have little or no effect on it. He also pointed out that the economic and social status of Stratford's students made it unlikely that they would normally attend a community college (84).

A survey of every private two-year college in the state is not necessary to deduce that the community college affected some and not others, depending on whether they competed for the same type of student in the local area. If the private college aimed for the out-of-state student of high economic and social status, the community college would be no great threat.

Did the 1966 General Assembly bring the evolution of public education to a suitable climax? In commenting on that year's assembly, one source stated that, while Virginia still lagged behind many other states in its educational system, "it is not too late to remedy our education deficiencies, but it might have been too late, if Governor Godwin and the General Assembly of 1966 had not moved massively to correct existing shortcomings" (27o). Senator James D. Hagood, Virginia's senior senator and chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, felt that the more progressive

attitude of the 1966 General Assembly was due to "demands from the people . . . (for) more services and better educational facilities." He believed that the governor's community college program would go a long way toward improving conditions at the colleges and universities (25b).

Another comment on the 1966 session called it a "Momentous Legislative Session," stating that "provisions for the state's system of two-year junior colleges, for both liberal arts and technical instruction, may be the most notable single educational advance . . ." (25c).

Finally, this 1966 session moved one writer to venture "the hope that this . . . marks the beginning of Virginia's move into the mainstream of the nation." Speaking of higher education, the writer added that "the new program of community colleges . . . will launch the Commonwealth on a catch-up course" (26d).

Certainly Virginians were aware that the 1966 session was different. It was different in four ways: (1) it decided to commit the state to the concept that the majority of Virginians should have a chance at some type of post-high school education; (2) it provided the means for this change by providing a system of comprehensive community colleges that recognized the unique talents of more students than in the state's past; (3) it made a strong attempt--with a measurable amount of success--to bring all post-high school, two-year educational programs into one coordinated system; and (4) it recognized the needs and wishes of the people and of labor and industry for the means to meet the economic, social, and (to a degree) political aspirations of its citizens. The 1966 session's greatest difference was the creation of a statewide network of publicly supported comprehensive community colleges. While the evolutionary process of democratizing post-high school education continues in Virginia, the creation of the community college system by the 1966 General Assembly may be considered a major milestone.

Part VI

A FINAL WORD

In the fall of 1966, the two units of the community college system in operation were Northern Virginia Community College and Virginia Western Community College in Roanoke, with an enrollment of 3,578 students. By the fall of 1970, a total of 27,840 students were enrolled in the sixteen colleges presently comprising the system. In addition to those now in operation, three are scheduled to open during the next biennium. All evidence supports the state's intention to complete the twenty-two colleges called for in the state master plan. When this is accomplished, every citizen in the state will have a college within commuting distance and, if the colleges continue to be comprehensive, the state will indeed have done much to democratize the post-high school education of its citizens.

The present study has attempted to show that this broadened base of higher education was accomplished through an evolutionary process and to show that certain people in the state advocated some sort of broadening long before the actual development of the community colleges. An obvious question is why it took so long for the state to reach its present level in the extension of its post-high school educational opportunities.

One must point to the leadership in the movement to extend higher education in the state if one is to understand why the community colleges emerged. It is also necessary to consider that, while the 1966 sales tax provided needed revenue, it was, after all, simply another manifestation of this leadership in action. In addition, one must realize that industry, if it were to locate in Virginia, would require and expect a local supply of educated personnel. This was another role played by the state's political and industrial leadership. Certainly the people wanted more services in 1966 than they had had in earlier years, including more post-high school education.

All these factors obviously influenced the development of the community college system and, although they had long been present in varying degrees, the community college system did not emerge until the 1966 session of the General Assembly.

In the opinion of S. V. Martorana, it was "impossible, practically, to help Virginia leap into the future completely in one step . . . ."* He maintains that, before Virginia could move into anything as major as a statewide system of community colleges, a transition had to be made from the previously established traditions.

Dana B. Hamel, a relative newcomer to Virginia, sensed this intangible factor that operates in tradition-rich (and often tradition-bound) Virginia. He remarked in July 1968 (after being in the state less than five years):

> In Virginia we have to move in cycles that are acceptable to the people. The people were ready for technical education so we got the technical education program going, and in the meantime the people then became ready for the next step and so it has taken the leadership and sharpness of both governors (Harrison and Godwin) to see when the people were ready and to move and strike while the iron was hot, so to speak (80).

In a personal interview, T. Edward Temple was fully aware that some people feared that the community college system was developing too rapidly. Others, of course, felt that it was moving too slowly. He remarked that his "personal opinion is that we have moved at a rate consistent with the rate Virginia is geared to move. I

---

*Telephone interview with Martorana. Martorana felt that the late 1950s saw the peak of a transition period--a peak that should have allowed the state to broaden substantially its post-high school educational offerings. That the Martorana plan failed to achieve its goals (see part three of this study) indicates that the state was not then ready for the transition to a statewide system of comprehensive two-year colleges.

do not think we could have moved much faster, because it involved a complete change in philosophy" (91).

Carter O. Lowance, who had been close to the governor's office longer than perhaps any other single Virginian and who knew how the political machine in the state operated, expressed the belief that the coming of the community college system has been "an evolutionary development dating back a number of years." He added that the need for more higher education

> . . . has been a gradual evolution of emphasis to the point where it is now universally recognized. We had to do more in the field of higher education in order to accommodate the changes in our whole social structure, our economy, and government itself, because, broadly speaking, a high school education twenty years ago might have been the equivalent of a college education today. I think again that it was a process that was inevitable and gradual (82).

Both W. Roy Smith and D. French Slaughter were also aware that Virginia could not be pushed too rapidly, that it was necessary for the state to move through the technical college "phase" before moving on to the comprehensive community college. They felt that it was too much to expect the legislators to approve a wholly new system in one giant step. The approach they recommended--what appears to be the "Virginia approach"--was to move one step at a time in extending post-high school education (87, 88).

Governor Harrison also remarked that things do not "just happen" in his native state. In speaking of the proper timing (whether in politics or in education--which are often the same), he stated:

> You will find that you always have to maintain a delicate balance between the ability and willingness of the people to pay for public services and the need and necessity of providing those services. You have the people who pay for services on the one side,

> and you have the obligation of the State to provide facilities and services on the other. It is up to the governor, and the General Assembly, to maintain that balance, because if you move too far too fast and too recklessly or extravagantly, then you will find rebellion on the part of the taxpayer. Therefore, you must have public sentiment and support with you. At the same time, if the governor and legislators fail to provide what the public has a right to demand, then you will find the people will elect officials who will provide these services. It is not easy to maintain that balance . . . (81).

The balance was obviously right for the creation of the system of community colleges in 1966.

Some of the foregoing statements regarding Virginia's evolutionary approach to extending its higher education came from politicians who had, in part, been responsible for the failure of the state to move any faster than it had in this direction. Perhaps the process could have been accelerated if certain people in the state had been more willing to work toward making statewide post-high school education available. Although the need was certainly documented by the Martorana study in 1959, no major political figure came forth at that time to support it.

Many key figures in the development of the community college system point out that in Virginia things happen gradually and in an evolutionary fashion. Is Virginia unique in this respect? Since this study is not comparing Virginia with any other state, the answer must be limited to some remarks concerning the Virginia situation. The state used two other common methods of offering post-high school education to the youth of the state before deciding to combine them in a comprehensive community college system, namely, branch colleges and technical colleges. Virginia has been, until recently, unique in its political situation. It has had no "political revolutions" with one party being replaced by another; nor has it had any political

changeover in the governor's chair. In 1926, Harry F. Byrd was elected governor of Virginia. It is generally conceded that his organization or "machine" dominated the state Democratic Party and the election of governors through the election of 1965. Most progress during those years was made through the accepted channels of the state Democratic Party. Moreover, since none of the key political figures in this study chose to challenge the evolutionary process of Virginia's politics, one can conclude that the situation encouraged a cautious approach to any problem-solving--even more education for the state's youth.

Virginia is also unique in its strong emphasis on the past. In a recent speech in historic Williamsburg, Governor Godwin went far back in Virginia history to find a philosophical base for the community college system. He said that the present-day community colleges "are in accord with Jefferson's belief that freedom cannot survive in the midst of ignorance and that higher education, therefore, cannot only be for those who were born to it or who can afford it" (28n). Godwin's statement supports the thesis that Virginia has now reached the state in its development where education is no longer for those "who were born to it or who can afford it." Education in Virginia today is for the many because, by 1966, the thinking of Virginians had evolved to where they recognized not only the need for a broader base of higher education, but also the means of achieving it. The means was a statewide system of state-supported comprehensive community colleges to democratize post-high school education for the citizens of the state of Virginia.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS

1. Blocker, Clyde E.; Plummer, Robert H.; and Richardson, Richard C., Jr. The Two-Year College: A Social Synthesis. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1965.

2. Bogue, Jesse Parker. The Community College. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1950.

3. Brick, Michael. Forum and Focus for the Junior College Movement: The American Association of Junior Colleges. Morningside Heights, N. Y.: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia U., 1964.

4. Brownell, Baker. The College and the Community: A Critical Study of Higher Education. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1952.

5. Clark, Burton R. The Open Door College: A Case Study. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960.

6. Conant, James Bryant. Education in a Divided World. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard U. Press, 1948.

7. Eells, Walter Crosby. The Junior College. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1931.

8. Fields, Ralph R. The Community College Movement. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962.

9. Gates, Robbins L. The Making of Massive Resistance: Virginia's Politics of Public School Desegregation, 1954-1956. Chapel Hill, N. C.: U. of North Carolina Press, 1962.

10. Jencks, Christopher, and Riesman, David. The Academic Revolution. Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday and Co., 1968.

11. Junior College Directories 1966, 1967. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, (a) 1966, (b) 1967.

12. Junior Colleges: 20 States. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1966.

13. Koos, Leonard V. The Junior-College. 2 vols. Minneapolis: U. of Minnesota, 1924.

14. Schietinger, E. F. Fact Book on Higher Education in the South. Atlanta, Ga.: Southern Regional Education Board, 1965.

15. Wilkinson, Harvie J. III. Harry Byrd and the Changing Face of Virginia Politics: 1945-1966. Charlottesville, Va.: The University Press of Virginia, 1968.

ARTICLES

16. Brownell, Baker. "The College and the Community." Journal of Higher Education, Jun 1946, p. 294-300.

17. Conant, James B. "The End of Orthodoxy." Saturday Review, Jan 13, 1968, p.50.

18. Holm, Edwin B. "The Importance of Education in the Economic Development of Virginia." Virginia Economic Review, Jly 1963, p. 1-5.

19. Zook, George F. "Changing Patterns of Junior College Education." Junior College Journal, May 1946, p. 411-417.

NEWSPAPERS

20. Daily Press (Newport News). Editorial, Jun 7, 1966.

21. Hopewell News. Jan 15, 1965.

22. Ledger-Star (Norfolk). Editorial, Aug 10, 1966.

23. News Virginia (Waynesboro). (a) Jun 30, 1965; (b) Jly 30, 1965; (c) Feb 16, 1966; (d) Feb 19, 1966.

24. Northern Virginia Sun (Arlington). Editorial, Jan 21, 1965.

25. Progress-Index (Petersburg). (a) May 5, 1965; (b) Editorial, Mar 11, 1966; (c) Mar 17, 1966; (d) May 4, 1966; (e) May 11, 1966; (f) Jun 2, 1966.

26. Richmond News Leader. (a) Feb 9, 1966; (b) Feb 11, 1966; (c) Mar 9, 1966; (d) Editorial, Mar 12, 1966; (e) Jun 2, 1966; (f) Aug 16, 1966; (g) Aug 29, 1966.

27. Richmond Times-Dispatch. (a) Editorial, Sep 3, 1950; (b) Nov 7, 1964; (c) Editorial, Dec 31, 1964; (d) Apr 25, 1965; (e) Jan 9, 1966; (f) Editorial, Jan 9, 1966; (g) Feb 8, 1966; (h) Feb 10, 1966; (i) Feb 11, 1966; (j) Mar 9, 1966; (k) Mar 27, 1966; (L) Apr 21, 1966; (m) Editorial, May 8, 1966; (n) May 10, 1966; (o) Editorial, Jly 5, 1966; (p) Aug 2, 1966; (q) Editorial, Aug 15, 1966.

28. The Roanoke Times. Editorial, Dec 31, 1964; (a) Mar 18, 1965; (b) Apr 6, 1965; (c) Editorial, Feb 6, 1966; (d) Feb 7, 1966; (e) Feb 11, 1966; (f) Feb 12, 1966; (g) Feb 16, 1966; (h) Mar 8, 1966; (i) Mar 9, 1966; (j) Mar 10, 1966; (k) May 19, 1966; (L) Jun 19, 1966; (m) Oct 24, 1969; (n) Dec 28, 1969.

29. The Roanoke World-News. (a) Editorial, Dec 30, 1964; (b) Feb 5, 1965; (c) Editorial, Jan 26, 1966; (d) Feb 2, 1966; (e) Editorial, Feb 5, 1966; (f) Feb 7, 1966; (g) Feb 10, 1966; (h) Mar 19, 1966; (i) May 7, 1966; (j) May 19, 1966; (k) Aug 5, 1966; (L) Editorial, Aug 8, 1966.

30. The Virginian-Pilot (Norfolk). (a) Feb 10, 1966; (b) May 2, 1966; (c) May 12, 1966; (d) May 13, 1966; (e) Aug 27, 1966; (f) Editorial, Nov 21, 1966.

31. The Washington Post. (a) Apr 9, 1965; (b) Nov 17, 1965.

REPORTS, PROCEEDINGS, AND PUBLIC DOCUMENTS

32. Acts and Joint Resolutions of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Virginia, 1964, 1966. Richmond, Va.: Commonwealth of Va., Department of Purchases and Supply, (a) 1964; (b) 1966.

33. Biennial Report of the State Council of Higher Education to the Governor of Virginia and the General Assembly of Virginia: 1958-60. Richmond, Va.: State Council of Higher Education, 1960.

34. Biennial Report of the State Council of Higher Education to the Governor and the General Assembly of Virginia. Part II. Richmond, Va.: State Council of Higher Education, 1961.

35. Brumbaugh, A. J. The Two-Year College in Virginia. Richmond, Va.: State Council of Higher Education, 1965.

36. Code of Virginia, Vol. V, Title 23, Chapter 1.1. Richmond, Va.: Commonwealth of Va., Department of Purchases and Supply, 1956.

37. Commission on Reorganization of the State Government. Richmond, Va.: Commonwealth of Va., Division of Purchase and Printing, 1947.

38. Connor, James R. State-Wide Pattern of Higher Education in Virginia. Richmond, Va.: Commonwealth of Va., State Council of Higher Education, 1965.

39. Crisis in Higher Education in Virginia and a Solution: Report of the Virginia Advisory Legislative Council to the Governor and the General Assembly of Virginia. Richmond, Va.: Commonwealth of Va., Division of Purchase and Printing, 1955.

40. Farrier, Paul H. "Can Top Quartile Virginia High School Graduates Afford to Go to College?" Richmond, Va.: The Association of Virginia Colleges, 1950.

41. Goals for Americans: The Report of the President's Commission on National Goals. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1960.

42. Godwin, Mills E., Jr. Address of Mills E. Godwin, Jr., Governor, to the General Assembly, Monday, January 17, 1966. Richmond, Va.: Commonwealth of Va., Department of Purchases and Supply, 1966.

43. Guide for the Establishment of Technical Colleges in Virginia. Richmond, Va.: State Department of Technical Education, 1965.

44. Hamrick, Joseph G. Education and Economic Growth. Williamsburg, Va.: College of William and Mary, 1964. (Pamphlet)

45. Harrison, Albertis S., Jr. Inaugural Address of Albertis S. Harrison, Jr., Governor, to the General Assembly and the People of Virginia, Saturday, January 13, 1962. Richmond, Va.: Commonwealth of Va., Department of Purchases and Supply, 1962.

46. Harrison, Albertis S., Jr. Address of Albertis S. Harrison, Jr., Governor, to the General Assembly of Virginia, (a) January 15, 1962; (b) January 8, 1964; (c) January 12, 1966. Richmond, Va.: Commonwealth of Va., Department of Purchases and Supply.

47. Higher Education and Economic Development in Virginia: A Special Report of the Council of Presidents, State-Aided Institutions of Higher Learning in Virginia. Richmond, Va.: Commonwealth of Va., 1963.

48. Higher Education and the Economic Development of Virginia. Richmond, Va.: Virginia State Chamber of Commerce, 1963.

49. Higher Education for American Democracy: A Report of the President's Commission on Higher Education. 6 vols. Washington, D. C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1947.

50. Higher Education in Virginia and Its Cost to the Taxpayer and Student: A Report of the Commission to Study Tuition Charges and Other Matters in State-Supported Institutions of Higher Learning to the Governor and the General Assembly of Virginia. Richmond, Va.: Commonwealth of Va., Department of Purchases and Supply, 1959.

51. Higher Education in Virginia: Report of the Virginia Advisory Legislative Council to the Governor and the General Assembly of Virginia. Richmond, Va.: Commonwealth of Va., Division of Purchase and Printing, 1951.

52. Higher Education in Virginia: Report on Higher Education in Virginia. Richmond, Va.: Commonwealth of Va., Division of Purchase and Printing, 1936.

53. Higher Education in the Tidewater Area of Virginia: A Condensation of the Complete Survey Report for the State Council of Higher Education of Virginia and the Norfolk Junior Chamber of Commerce. Washington, D. C.: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1959.

54. Journal of the House of Delegates of the Commonwealth of Virginia, 1964, 1966. Richmond, Va.: Commonwealth of Va., Department of Purchases and Supply, (a) 1964, (b) 1966.

55. Journal of the Senate of Virginia. Richmond, Va.: Commonwealth of Va., Department of Purchases and Supply, 1964.

56. Needs, Policies, and Plans for 2-Year Colleges in Virginia. Richmond, Va.: Commonwealth of Va., State Council of Higher Education, 1959.

57. Policies, Procedures, and Regulations Governing the Establishment and Operation of the Program of Comprehensive Community Colleges in the Commonwealth of Virginia as Authorized by the 1966 General Assembly. Richmond, Va.: State Board for Community Colleges, 1966.

58. Price, James H. Messages of James H. Price, Governor. Richmond, Va.: Commonwealth of Va., Division of Purchase and Printing, 1940.

59. A Proposed Master Plan for a State-Wide System of Community College Education in Virginia. Richmond, Va.: State Department of Community Colleges, 1967.

60. Public Education in Virginia: Report of the Educational Commission of Virginia of a Survey of the Public Educational System of the State. Richmond, Va.: Superintendent of Public Printing, 1928.

61. Public Education: Report of the Commission to the Governor of Virginia. Richmond, Va.: Commonwealth of Va., Division of Purchase and Printing, 1955.

62. Report of the Commission on Goals for Higher Education in the South. Within Our Reach. Atlanta, Ga.: Southern Regional Education Board, 1961.

63. Report of the Subcommittee on Higher Education of the Research Committee on Education of the Governor's Advisory Council on the Virginia Economy. Richmond, Va.: Commonwealth of Va., 1950.

64. Russell, John Dale. Report of the Higher Education Study Commission. Richmond, Va.: Commonwealth of Va., State Council of Higher Education, 1965.

65. Thompson, Lorin A. Prospective College-Age Population in Virginia by Subregions, 1960-1985. Richmond, Va.: Commonwealth of Va., State Council of Higher Education, 1965.

66. Virginia Public School System: Report of the Virginia Education Commission. Richmond, Va.: Commonwealth of Va., Division of Purchase and Printing, 1945.

67. Virginia Public Schools Education Commission's Report to the Assembly of Virginia: Survey Staff's Report to the Education Commission. Richmond, Va.: Everett Waddey Co., 1919.

68. Virginia, State Board of Education. Expanding Education to Meet the Needs of Rural Community Life in Virginia, by Sidney B. Hall. Richmond, Va.: State Board of Education, 1940.

69. Vocational and Technical Education in Virginia: Present and Future Needs; Report of the Commission on Vocational Education to the Governor and the General Assembly of Virginia. Richmond, Va.: Commonwealth of Va., Department of Purchases and Supply, 1963.

UNPUBLISHED MATERIALS

70. Alderman, Edwin A. "The Present State of Higher Education in Virginia." Richmond, Va.: Central Committee, Institutions of Higher Education in Virginia, 1925.

71. Bryant, Milford Howard. "Factors Affecting the Decision of Top Quarter High School Graduates Not to Go to College." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, U. of Virginia, 1957.

72. Eggleston, J. D., Jr. "Extension Work in Virginia--Its Possibilities and Needs." Address delivered to the annual meeting of the State Farmers Institute, (1909).

73. LeCroy, Jan Richard. "Academic Characteristics of Two-Year College Students in Virginia." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, U. of Texas, 1966.

74. Tunstall, Robert B. "The Duty of the State to Higher Education." Richmond, Va.: Central Committee, Institutions of Higher Education in Virginia, 1925.

75. West, Thomas W. "A History of Marion College," Unpublished manuscript, Marion, Va., 1969.

OTHER SOURCES

76. Anderson, Conwell A. President, Averett College. Telephone interview, Dec 19, 1969.

77. Bird, Lloyd C. State Senator. Personal interview, Richmond, Va., Aug 19, 1968.

78. Dutton, Sherman P. Director of the Martinsville branch of the University of Virginia. Personal interview, Martinsville, Va., Jly, 1968.

79. Hahn, T. Marshall. President, Virginia Polytechnic Institute. Personal interview, Blacksburg, Va., Aug 26, 1968.

80. Hamel, Dana B. Chancellor, Virginia Community College System. Personal interview, Richmond, Va., Jly 22, 1968.

81. Harrison, Albertis S., Jr. Governor of Virginia from 1962 to January, 1966. Personal interview, Lawrenceville, Va., Aug 27, 1968.

82. Lowance, Carter O. Executive Assistant to six Virginia governors, including Harrison and Godwin. Personal interview, Richmond, Va., Aug 19, 1968.

83. Martorana, S. V. Executive Dean for two-year colleges in the State University of New York. Telephone interview, Nov 11, 1969.

84. Moomaw, W. Hugh. President, Stratford College. Telephone interview, Dec 23, 1969.

85. Puyear, Donald E. President, Virginia Highlands Community College. Personal interview, Clifton Forge, Va., Jun 28, 1968.

86. Salyers, William A., Jr. Student at Dabney S. Lancaster Community College at the time of the interview. Personal interview, Clifton Forge, Va., Aug 23, 1968.

87. Slaughter, D. French. Member of the House of Delegates. Personal interview, Culpeper, Va., Aug 6, 1968.

88. Smith, W. Roy. Member of the House of Delegates. Personal interview, Richmond, Va., Sep 5, 1968.

89. Stone, Kathryn H. Ex-member of the House of Delegates. Personal interview, Washington, D. C., Aug 7, 1968.

90. Stone, William. State Senator. Personal interview, Martinsville, Va., Jly 31, 1968.

91. Temple, T. Edward. Director of the Division of Planning for Virginia at the time of the interview. Personal interview, Richmond, Va., Aug 23, 1968.

92. Warren, Thomas E. Chairman, Local Board, Dabney S. Lancaster Community College. Personal interview, Clifton Forge, Va., Jly 2, 1968.

93. Woodard, Prince B. Director, State Council of Higher Education at the time of the interview. Personal interview, Richmond, Va., Sep 4, 1968.

GPO 910-858